

A theory of passive linear systems with no assumptions

Timothy H. Hughes ^{a,★}

^aUniversity of Cambridge Department of Engineering, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, CB2 1PZ, UK

Abstract

We present two linked theorems on passivity: the passive behavior theorem, parts 1 and 2. Part 1 provides necessary and sufficient conditions for a general linear system, described by a set of high order differential equations, to be passive. Part 2 extends the positive-real lemma to include uncontrollable and unobservable state-space models.

Key words: Passive system; Positive-real lemma; Linear system; Controllability; Observability; Behaviors.

1 Introduction

A system is called *passive* if there is an upper bound on the net energy which can be extracted from the system from the present time onwards. This is a fundamental property of many physical systems. The role of passivity in systems and control theory has its origins in the study of electric networks comprising resistors, inductors, capacitors, transformers, and gyrators (RLCTG networks). In contemporary systems theory, passive systems are more familiar through their role in the positive-real lemma. This lemma expresses the equivalence of: (i) an integral condition related to the energy exchanged with the system; (ii) a condition on the transfer function for the system (the positive-real condition); and (iii) a linear matrix inequality involving the matrices in a state-space realization for the system. In addition to its value for the study of passive systems, the lemma also gives necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of non-negative definite solutions to an important linear matrix inequality and algebraic Riccati equation, and has links with spectral factorisation. However, these results are all subject to one caveat: the system is assumed to be controllable.

As emphasised by Çamlibel et al. (2003); Willems (2007); Hughes and Smith (2015), there is no explicit connection between the concepts of passivity and controllability. Moreover, the a-priori assumption of controllability in the positive-real lemma leaves open several

questions of physical significance. In particular, it is not known what uncontrollable behaviors can be realized as the driving-point behavior of an electric (RLCTG) network. Similarly, necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a non-negative definite solution to the linear matrix inequality (and algebraic Riccati equation) considered in the positive-real lemma are unknown when the state-space realization under consideration is uncontrollable. There have been many papers in the literature which have aimed to relax the assumption of controllability in the positive-real lemma, e.g., Pandolfi (2001); Collado et al. (2001); Kunitatsu et al. (2008) (and many papers have studied uncontrollable cyclo-dissipative systems, e.g., Ferrante and Pandolfi (2002); Çamlibel et al. (2003); Ferrante (2005); Pal and Belur (2008)), but all of these papers contain other a-priori assumptions. The objective of this paper is to provide a complete theory of passive linear systems with no superfluous assumptions. Our main contributions are: 1. a new trajectory-based definition of passivity (Definition 4); and 2. two linked theorems which we call the *passive behavior theorem*, parts 1 and 2. Part 1 (Theorem 7) provides necessary and sufficient conditions for the passivity of a general linear system (described by a differential equation of the form $P(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i} = Q(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}$ for some square polynomial matrices P and Q). In particular, we find that any passive behavior can be realized as the driving-point behavior of an electric (RLCTG) network. This generalizes classical results which are restricted to controllable behaviors (where P and Q are left coprime). Part 2 (Theorem 11) extends the positive-real lemma by removing the a-priori controllability and observability assumptions.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we discuss the positive-real lemma and its limitations. Sec-

★ A simpler version of Theorem 11 in this paper, for single-input single-output systems, was presented at the European Control Conference, Aalborg, 2016 (see Hughes (2016b)).

Email address: thh22@cam.ac.uk (Timothy H. Hughes).

tion 3 discusses our new definition of *passivity*. Then, in Section 4, we introduce the new concept of a *positive-real pair*, and we state our two passive behavior theorems. It is shown that our new concept of a positive-real pair provides the appropriate extension of the positive-real concept to uncontrollable systems. Specifically, for any pair of square polynomial matrices P and Q , we show that the system corresponding to the solutions to the differential equation $P(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i} = Q(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}$ is passive if and only if (P, Q) is a positive-real pair. The proofs of the passive behavior theorems are in Section 6, and some preliminary results appear in Section 5. The paper is strongly influenced by the behavioral approach to dynamical systems (see Polderman and Willems (1998)). To make the paper accessible to the reader unfamiliar with behavioral theory, we provide four short appendices containing relevant background on linear systems, behaviors, and polynomial matrices. These contain numbered notes (A1, A2, and so forth) which will be referred to in the text. The reader who wishes to follow the proofs in Sections 5 and 6 is advised to first read these appendices.

The notation is as follows. $\mathbb{R}$ ($\mathbb{C}$) denotes the real (complex) numbers; $\mathbb{C}_+$ ($\bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$) denotes the open (closed) right-half plane; $\mathbb{C}_-$ ($\bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$) denotes the open (closed) left-half plane. If $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, then $\Re(\lambda)$ ($\Im(\lambda)$) denotes its real (imaginary) part, and $\bar{\lambda}$ its complex conjugate. $\mathbb{R}[\xi]$ ($\mathbb{R}(\xi)$) denotes the polynomials (rational functions) in the indeterminate ξ with real coefficients. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be any one of $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{R}[\xi]$ or $\mathbb{R}(\xi)$, then $\mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$ ($\mathbb{F}^n$) denotes the matrices with m (1) columns and n rows with entries from $\mathbb{F}$. If $H \in \mathbb{F}^{m \times n}$, then H^T denotes its transpose; and if H is nonsingular (i.e., $\det(H) \neq 0$), then H^{-1} denotes its inverse. We let $\text{col}(H_1 \dots H_n)$ ($\text{diag}(H_1 \dots H_n)$) denote the block column (block diagonal) matrix with entries $H_1, \dots, H_n$. If $M \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}$, then $M > 0$ ($M \geq 0$) indicates that M is Hermitian positive (non-negative) definite, and $\text{spec}(M) := \{\lambda \mid \det(\lambda I - M) = 0\}$. If $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}(\xi)$, then $\text{normalrank}(G) := \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}}(\text{rank}(G(\lambda)))$, $G^*(\xi) := G(-\xi)^T$, G is called *para-Hermitian* if $G = G^*$, and *proper* if $\lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} (G(\xi))$ exists. $\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ and $\mathcal{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^k)$ denote the (k -vector-valued) locally integrable and infinitely-often differentiable functions (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Definitions 2.3.3, 2.3.4). We equate any two locally integrable functions which differ only on a set of measure zero. A k -vector-valued function $\mathbf{w}$ is called absolutely continuous (denoted $\mathbf{w} \in AC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^k)$) if (i) $\mathbf{w}$ is continuous; (ii) $\mathbf{w}$ is differentiable for all $\mathbb{R}$ with the possible exception of a set of measure zero; and (iii) for any given $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the derivative $\frac{d\mathbf{w}}{dt}$ satisfies $\mathbf{w}(t_1) = \mathbf{w}(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \frac{d\mathbf{w}}{dt}(t)dt$ for all $t_1 \geq t_0$. We also define the function space

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^k) := \{\mathbf{w} \mid \mathbf{w}(t) = \Re\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=0}^{n_i-1} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{ij} t^j e^{\lambda_i t}\right) \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R} \\ \text{with } \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}^k, \lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}_-, \text{ and } N, n_i \text{ integers}\}.$$

We consider the following types of behaviors (systems): (i) the set of *weak* solutions (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Section 2.3.2) to a linear differential equation:

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^k) \mid R(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{w} = 0\}, R \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times k}[\xi]; \quad (1.1)$$

and (ii) the projection of a behavior $\mathcal{B}$ as in (1.1) onto a subset of its components. Here, for any given $T_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{l_1 \times k}, \dots, T_n \in \mathbb{R}^{l_n \times k}$ such that $\text{col}(T_1 \dots T_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ is a permutation matrix, and integer $1 \leq m \leq n$, we denote the projection of $\mathcal{B}$ onto $T_1 \mathbf{w}, \dots, T_m \mathbf{w}$ by

$$\mathcal{B}^{(T_1 \mathbf{w}, \dots, T_m \mathbf{w})} = \{(T_1 \mathbf{w}, \dots, T_m \mathbf{w}) \mid \exists (T_{m+1} \mathbf{w}, \dots, T_n \mathbf{w}) \\ \text{such that } \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

2 The positive-real lemma

The central role of passivity in systems and control is exemplified by the positive-real lemma (see Lemma 1). The name positive-real (PR) describes a function $G \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}(\xi)$ with the properties: (i) G is analytic in $\mathbb{C}_+$; and (ii) $G(\lambda)^T + G(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Condition (ii) may equivalently be replaced by (iii) $G(-j\omega)^T + G(j\omega) \geq 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R} \cup \infty$, $j\omega$ not a pole of G , and the poles of G on $j\mathbb{R} \cup \infty$ are simple and their residue matrices are Hermitian non-negative definite (Anderson and Vongpanitlerd, 1973, Theorem 2.7.2). The positive-real lemma then considers a state-space model:

$$\mathcal{B}_s = \{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times AC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d) \\ \text{such that } \frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = A\mathbf{x} + B\mathbf{u} \text{ and } \mathbf{y} = C\mathbf{x} + D\mathbf{u}\}, \\ \text{with } A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}, C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \quad (2.1)$$

and provides necessary and sufficient conditions for the transfer function $G(\xi) = D + C(\xi I - A)^{-1}B$ to be PR (the reason for specifying $\mathbf{x} \in AC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$ is explained in note D1). It is assumed that (A, B) is controllable, and (C, A) is observable, which amount to the constraints:

$$(A, B) \text{ is controllable} \Leftrightarrow \text{rank}([B \ AB \ \dots \ A^{d-1}B]) = d \\ (C, A) \text{ is observable} \Leftrightarrow \text{rank}(\text{col}(C \ CA \ \dots \ CA^{d-1})) = d.$$

Lemma 1 (Positive-real lemma) *Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (2.1) and let (A, B) be controllable and (C, A) observable. The following are equivalent:*

1. *Given any $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists $S_a(\mathbf{x}_0) \in \mathbb{R}$ with*

$$S_a(\mathbf{x}_0) := \sup_{\substack{t_1 \geq t_0 \in \mathbb{R}, (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s \\ \text{with } \mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0}} \left(- \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{u}^T(t) \mathbf{y}(t) dt \right).$$
2. *$\sup_{\substack{t_1 \geq t_0 \in \mathbb{R}, (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s \\ \text{with } \mathbf{x}(t_0) = 0}} \left(- \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{u}^T(t) \mathbf{y}(t) dt \right) = 0$.*

3. There exist real matrices X, L_X, W_X such that $X > 0$, $-A^T X - XA = L_X^T L_X$, $C - B^T X = W_X^T L_X$, and $D + D^T = W_X^T W_X$.
4. $G(\xi) := D + C(\xi I - A)^{-1} B$ is PR.

If, in addition, $D + D^T > 0$, then the above conditions are equivalent to:

5. There exists a real $X > 0$ such that $\Pi(X) := -A^T X - XA - (C^T - XB)(D + D^T)^{-1}(C - B^T X) = 0$ and $\text{spec}(A + B(D + D^T)^{-1}(B^T X - C)) \in \mathbb{C}_-$.

For a proof of the positive-real lemma, we refer to Willems (1972b); Anderson and Vongpanitlerd (1973). These references also describe links with spectral factorization, which is the concern of the following well known result (Youla, 1961, Theorem 2):

Lemma 2 (Youla's spectral factorisation result)

Let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}(\xi)$ be para-Hermitian; let $H(j\omega) \geq 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, ω not a pole of H ; and let $\text{normalrank}(H) = r$. There exists a $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}(\xi)$ such that (i) $H = Z^* Z$; (ii) Z is analytic in $\mathbb{C}_+$; and (iii) $Z(\lambda)$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Moreover, if $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]$, then $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}[\xi]$; if $H(j\omega)$ is analytic for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, then Z is analytic in $\mathbb{C}_+$; and if $Z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}(\xi)$ also satisfies (i)–(iii), then there exists a $T \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ such that $Z_1 = TZ$ and $T^T T = I$. We call any $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}(\xi)$ which satisfies (i)–(iii) a spectral factor of H .

When G is as in Lemma 1 with $D + D^T > 0$, there exists $W_X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $D + D^T = W_X^T W_X$. Then, with X as in condition 5 of Lemma 1, it can be shown that $Z_X(\xi) := W_X + (W_X^T)^{-1}(C - B^T X)(\xi I - A)^{-1} B$ is a spectral factor of $G + G^*$ (see Willems (1972b)).

The assumptions in Lemma 1 can be relaxed in three particularly notable ways. First, from (Willems, 1971, Theorems 1, 3, 8), conditions 1–4 of Lemma 1 are equivalent even if (C, A) is not observable, but X may then be singular in condition 3. Second, the following are equivalent irrespective of whether (A, B) is controllable or (C, A) is observable: (i) $\text{spec}(A) \in \mathbb{C}_-$ and $G(-j\omega)^T + G(j\omega) > 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R} \cup \infty$; and (ii) the existence of a real symmetric $X \geq 0$ such that $\Pi(X) = 0$ and $\text{spec}(A + B(D + D^T)^{-1}(B^T X - C)) \in \mathbb{C}_-$ (Zhou et al., 1996, Corollary 13.27). Third, if $\text{spec}(A) \in \mathbb{C}_-$, then condition 3 in Lemma 1 is equivalent to condition 4 together with the additional condition (Pandolfi, 2001, equation (4)) (this condition is discussed in Remark 20).

Nevertheless, the results in these references, and other similar results in the literature (e.g., Collado et al. (2001); Kunitatsu et al. (2008)), do not cover several important systems. In particular, they do not consider systems whose transfer functions possess imaginary axis poles. We consider one such system in Example

3. Other important examples include conservative systems, whose transfer functions are lossless PR (see Anderson and Vongpanitlerd (1973)).

Example 3 Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (2.1) with

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and } D = 1.$$

Here, (A, B) is not controllable. We now show that conditions 2 and 4 of Lemma 1 hold for this example, yet condition 1 does not. First, direct calculation verifies that $G(\xi) = 1 + 1/\xi$, and so condition 4 is satisfied. Second, from the variation of the constants formula (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Section 4.5.2), $y(t) = x_1(t_0) + (2 \cos(t - t_0) - 1)x_2(t_0) + 2 \sin(t - t_0)x_3(t_0) + u(t) + \int_{t_0}^t u(\tau) d\tau$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Hence, if $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = 0$ and $t_1 \geq t_0$, then $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} u(t)y(t)dt = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} u^2(t)dt + \frac{1}{2}(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} u(\tau)d\tau)^2 \geq 0$, and so condition 2 is satisfied. Third, with $x_1(0) = x_2(0) = 0$, $x_3(0) = -1$, and $u(t) = \sin(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$, then $y(t) = -\sin(t) - \cos(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Thus, for any given positive integer n , $-\int_0^{n\pi} y(t)u(t)dt = \int_0^{n\pi} \sin^2(t)dt + \int_0^{n\pi} \sin(t)\cos(t)dt = \frac{1}{2}n\pi$. It follows that condition 1 does not hold. Furthermore, it will follow from Theorem 11 of this paper that condition 3 of Lemma 1 does not hold for this system.

One of the main contributions of this paper is a generalization of the positive-real lemma to include state-space models which are not necessarily controllable or observable (Theorem 11). In contrast to other papers on this subject, we do not introduce any superfluous assumptions. However, as we will argue in the next section, a state-space model is not a natural starting point for the study of passive systems. Thus, a second major contribution of this paper is a necessary and sufficient condition for the passivity of a general linear system, described by a set of high order differential equations (Theorem 7).

3 Passivity

The concept of passivity is relevant to systems whose variables can be partitioned into two sets $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ with the property that $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{i}^T(t)\mathbf{v}(t)dt$ is the net energy extracted from the system in the interval from t_0 to t_1 . Passivity has its origins in the study of electric RLCTG networks, for which $\mathbf{i}$ represents the driving-point currents and $\mathbf{v}$ the corresponding driving-point voltages. For any given RLCTG network, it can be shown that the driving-point currents and voltages are related by a linear differential equation of the form:

$$\mathcal{B} = \{(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \mid P(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i} = Q(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}, \text{ for some } P, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]\}. \quad (3.1)$$

Note that $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v})$ need not be an *input-output partition* in the sense of Polderman and Willems (1998). Specifically, in (3.1), then: (i) Q could be singular; and (ii) $Q^{-1}P$ need not be proper. For example: (i) Q is singular for a transformer (whose behavior is characterised by the turns-ratio matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_2}$, and is determined by the linear equations $\mathbf{v}_1 = T^T \mathbf{v}_2$, and $\mathbf{i}_2 = -T \mathbf{i}_1$, with $\mathbf{v} = \text{col}(\mathbf{v}_1 \ \mathbf{v}_2)$, and $\mathbf{i} = \text{col}(\mathbf{i}_1 \ \mathbf{i}_2)$); and (ii) $Q^{-1}P(\xi) = L\xi$ for an inductor with inductance L . Yet it is common for passivity to be defined for systems described by a state-space model or an input-output partition. As will be discussed later in this section, this implies assumptions that (i) Q is nonsingular; and (ii) $Q^{-1}P$ is proper. Accordingly, we provide a new definition of passivity for the general system in (3.1) which does not depend on such assumptions. Note that this definition extends naturally to non-linear/time-varying systems.

Definition 4 (Passive system) *The system $\mathcal{B}$ in (3.1) is called passive if, for any given $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a $K \in \mathbb{R}$ (dependent on $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v})$ and t_0) such that if $(\hat{\mathbf{i}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfies $(\hat{\mathbf{i}}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) = (\mathbf{i}(t), \mathbf{v}(t))$ for all $t < t_0$, then $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \hat{\mathbf{i}}^T(t) \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t) dt < K$ for all $t_1 \geq t_0$.*

In words, a system is passive if there is an upper bound to the net energy which can be extracted from the system from t_0 onwards. The upper bound depends on the past of the trajectory, but, given this past, the same upper bound applies to all possible future trajectories.

A detailed discussion of the issues with existing definitions of passivity (and dissipativity) was provided in (Willems, 2007, Section 8). However, for reasons detailed at the end of this section, our definition differs from a similar definition proposed by Willems (2007). First, we compare Definition 4 to the conditions of the positive-real lemma. Note that it is not essential to follow the discussion in the remainder of this section to understand the main results in the paper.

Condition 2 of Lemma 1 is sometimes stated as the definition of passivity for the system in (2.1) (e.g., (Anderson and Vongpanitlerd, 1973, Section 2.3)). However, the system in Example 3 satisfies this condition but is not passive in the sense of Definition 4. In other papers, condition 1 of Lemma 1 is stated as the definition for passivity (e.g., Willems (1972b)). It may be shown that this is consistent with Definition 4 when considering systems with an input-state-output representation as in (2.1) where $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{y}$. However, there are systems which are passive in the sense of Definition 4 which cannot be represented in this form. Specifically, as will be shown in Lemma 9, condition 1

of Lemma 1 only applies to systems of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \{ & (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \mid \\ & \tilde{P}(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{u} = \tilde{Q}(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{y}, \text{ where } \tilde{P}, \tilde{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi], \\ & \tilde{Q} \text{ is nonsingular, and } \tilde{Q}^{-1}\tilde{P} \text{ is proper} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Thus, this condition does not cover systems of the form of (4) for which either Q is singular or $Q^{-1}P$ is not proper.

Definition 4 is similar to a definition for dissipativity proposed in (Willems, 2007, Section 8) and used by Hughes and Smith (2015) (note that it is straightforward to generalize Definition 4 to the framework of dissipative systems). In Hughes and Smith (2015), the system $\mathcal{B}$ in (3.1) was called passive if, given any $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a $K \in \mathbb{R}$ (dependent on $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v})$ and t_0) such that $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{i}^T(t) \mathbf{v}(t) dt < K$ for all $t_1 \geq t_0$. Evidently, if the system $\mathcal{B}$ in (3.1) is passive in the sense of Definition 4, then $\mathcal{B}$ is also passive in the sense of Willems (2007); Hughes and Smith (2015). It may also be shown that the converse is true (it suffices to show that if $\mathcal{B}$ is passive in the sense of Hughes and Smith (2015), then condition 2 of Theorem 11 holds; this requires only minor adjustments to the proof given in this paper). However, Definition 4 is a more accurate statement of the physical property of passivity (when extended to time-varying and non-linear systems), as the following example demonstrates.

Example 5 Consider the behavior $\mathcal{B} = \{(u, y) \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \mid \exists x \in AC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \text{ with (i) } x(t) = 0 \text{ and } y(t) = 0 \text{ for all } t < 0; \text{ (ii) } \frac{dx}{dt}(t) = u(t) \text{ and } y(t) = 0 \text{ for all } 0 \leq t < 1; \text{ (iii) } \frac{dx}{dt}(t) = u(t) \text{ and } y(t) = 2x(t) \text{ for all } 1 \leq t < 2; \text{ and (iv) } \frac{dx}{dt}(t) = 0 \text{ and } y(t) = 0 \text{ for all } t \geq 2\}$. Thus, if either $t_0 \geq 2$ or $t_1 \leq 1$, then $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} u(t)y(t)dt = 0$; and if instead $t_1 > t_0$, $t_0 < 2$, and $t_1 > 1$, then $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} u(t)y(t)dt = -[x^2(t)]_{\max(1, t_0)}^{\min(2, t_1)} = -[(\int_0^t u(\tau)d\tau)^2]_{\max(1, t_0)}^{\min(2, t_1)} \leq (\int_0^{\max(1, t_0)} u(\tau)d\tau)^2$. It follows that, given any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a $K \in \mathbb{R}$ depending on t_0 and (u, y) such that $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} u(t)y(t)dt < K$ for all $t_1 \geq t_0$, and so $\mathcal{B}$ is passive in the sense of Hughes and Smith (2015). On the other hand, for any given $(u, y) \in \mathcal{B}$, $t_0 < 1$, and $K > 0$, there exists $(\hat{u}, \hat{y}) \in \mathcal{B}$ with $(\hat{u}(t), \hat{y}(t)) = (u(t), y(t))$ for all $t < t_0$ such that $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \hat{u}(t)\hat{y}(t)dt \geq K$ (e.g., let $\hat{u}(t) = \frac{1}{1-t_0}(\sqrt{K} - \int_0^{t_0} u(\tau)d\tau)$ for all $t_0 \leq t < 1$, and $\hat{u}(t) = -\sqrt{K}$ for all $t \geq 1$). We conclude that this system is not passive in the sense of Definition 4; if $t_0 < 1$, then an arbitrarily large amount of energy can be extracted from this system from t_0 onwards.

Motivated by electric (RLCTG) networks, we have introduced a definition for passivity for the system in (3.1).

The classical theory of electric networks provides necessary and sufficient conditions on P and Q for the system in (3.1) to be realized by an RLCTG network *providing P and Q are left coprime*. Yet, as emphasised in Çamlıbel et al. (2003), such conditions are unknown in cases when P and Q are not left coprime. More fundamentally, in these cases, necessary and sufficient conditions on P and Q for the system in (3.1) to be *passive* are also unknown. Such conditions are provided in Theorem 7 of this paper.

4 The passive behavior theorem

In this section, we present our new passive behavior theorem in two parts. The theorems use our new concept of a *positive-real pair*, which we define as follows:

Definition 6 Let $P, Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]$. We call (P, Q) a positive-real pair if the following conditions hold:

1. $P(\lambda)Q(\bar{\lambda})^T + Q(\lambda)P(\bar{\lambda})^T \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$.
2. $\text{rank}([P \ -Q](\lambda)) = n$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$.
3. If $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy $\mathbf{p}^T(PQ^* + QP^*) = 0$ and $\mathbf{p}(\lambda)^T[P \ -Q](\lambda) = 0$, then $\mathbf{p}(\lambda) = 0$.

A key result in behavioral theory is that any behavior (e.g., $\mathcal{B}$ in (3.1)) has a *controllable* part ($\mathcal{B}_c$ in Lemma 15) and an *autonomous* part ($\mathcal{B}_a$ in Lemma 15). As will be shown in Section 5, the conditions in Definition 6 can be understood in terms of $\mathcal{B}_c$ and $\mathcal{B}_a$. Roughly speaking, the passivity of $\mathcal{B}_c$ implies condition 1; the stability of $\mathcal{B}_a$ (and the stabilizability of $\mathcal{B}$) implies condition 2; and condition 3 is a coupling condition between the trajectories in $\mathcal{B}_a$ and the so-called *lossless* trajectories in $\mathcal{B}_c$. In particular, if the transfer function from $\mathbf{i}$ to $\mathbf{v}$ is lossless PR, then $PQ^* + QP^* = 0$, and condition 3 implies that P and Q are left coprime (so $\mathcal{B}$ is controllable).

We note that condition 1 of Definition 6 is a natural generalization of a positive-real transfer function $Q^{-1}P$ to the case with Q singular. Yet, as discussed in Section 3, this condition is not sufficient for the behavior $\mathcal{B}$ in (3.1) to be passive. As the following theorem demonstrates, conditions 2 and 3 are also required to obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for passivity.

Theorem 7 (Passive behavior theorem, Part 1)

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be as in (3.1). The following are equivalent:

1. $\mathcal{B}$ is passive.
2. (P, Q) is a positive-real pair.
3. There exist compatible partitions $\mathbf{i} = (\mathbf{i}_1, \mathbf{i}_2)$ and $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$ such that $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} := \mathcal{B}^{(\text{col}(\mathbf{i}_1 \ \mathbf{v}_2), \text{col}(\mathbf{v}_1 \ \mathbf{i}_2))}$ takes the form of (3.2), and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ is passive.

In addition, the conditions in the above theorem hold if and only if $\mathcal{B}$ is the driving-point behavior of an electric (RLCTG) network, but we do not prove this here.

Remark 8 In the terminology of behavioral theory, condition 3 of Theorem 7 implies that if $\mathcal{B}$ in (3.1) is passive then there exists an input-output partition *with the property that $\mathbf{i}^T \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{y}$* (in the context of electric networks, the input $\text{col}(\mathbf{i}_1 \ \mathbf{v}_2)$ contains exactly one variable, either current or voltage, for each port of the network). Note that, if $\mathcal{B}$ is as in (3.1) and $\text{normalrank}([P \ -Q]) = n$, then there exists a partitioning of $\text{col}(\mathbf{i} \ \mathbf{v})$ into $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ (known as an *input-output partitioning*) such that $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} := \mathcal{B}^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$ takes the form of (3.2) (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Section 3.3). However, this does not suffice to show condition 3 in Theorem 7. For example, for the system

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{d}{dt} + 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i_1 \\ i_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{d}{dt} + 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

it can be shown that there is no input-output partition with the property that $i_1 v_1 + i_2 v_2 = \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{y}$.

Condition 3 in Theorem 7 allows us to apply the following results on input-state-output representations of behaviors from Willems (1986); Rapisarda and Willems (1997); Hughes (2016a):

Lemma 9 Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (2.1). Then there exist $\tilde{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]$ and $\tilde{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}[\xi]$ such that (a) $\tilde{M}$ and $\tilde{N}$ are left coprime; and (b) $\tilde{M}(\xi)C = \tilde{N}(\xi)(\xi I - A)$. Furthermore, if $\tilde{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]$ and $\tilde{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}[\xi]$ satisfy conditions (a) and (b), and $\tilde{P} := \tilde{N}B + \tilde{M}D$ and $\tilde{Q} := \tilde{M}$, then $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} := \mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$ takes the form of (3.2).

Lemma 10 Let $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ be as in (3.2). Then there exist $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathcal{B}_s$ as in (2.1) such that $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{B}_s$ is as in (2.1) and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$, then there exist $\tilde{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]$ and $\tilde{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}[\xi]$ such that (i) conditions (a) and (b) of Lemma 9 are satisfied; and (ii) $\tilde{P}$ and $\tilde{Q}$ in (3.2) satisfy $\tilde{P} = \tilde{N}B + \tilde{M}D$ and $\tilde{Q} = \tilde{M}$.

Accordingly, with $\mathcal{B}_s$ as in (2.1), then to prove Theorem 7 we seek necessary and sufficient conditions for $\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$ to be passive. These conditions are provided by part 2 of our passive behavior theorem, which generalizes the positive-real lemma (Lemma 1) to state-space models which need not be controllable or observable.

Theorem 11 (Passive behavior theorem, Part 2)

Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (2.1); let $\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}$ be as in Lemma 9; and let $G(\xi) := D + C(\xi I - A)^{-1}B$. The following are equivalent:

1. $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} := \mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$ is passive.
2. $(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q})$ is a positive-real pair.

3. There exist real matrices X, L_X, W_X such that $X \geq 0$, $-A^T X - XA = L_X^T L_X$, $C - B^T X = W_X^T L_X$, and $D + D^T = W_X^T W_X$.
4. There exist real matrices X, L_X, W_X as in condition 3 which have the additional property that $W_X + L_X(\xi I - A)^{-1}B$ is a spectral factor of $G + G^*$.

If, in addition, $D + D^T > 0$, then the above conditions are equivalent to:

5. There exists a real $X \geq 0$ such that $\Pi(X) := -A^T X - XA - (C^T - XB)(D + D^T)^{-1}(C - B^T X) = 0$.

Now, suppose conditions 1–4 hold. Then:

- (i) If (C, A) is observable and X is as in condition 3, then (a) $X > 0$; and (b) $\text{spec}(A) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$.
- (ii) If $D + D^T > 0$ and X is as in condition 4, then (a) $\Pi(X) = 0$; and (b) $\text{spec}(A + B(D + D^T)^{-1}(B^T X - C)) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$ if and only if $\text{spec}(A) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$.

Remark 12 Note that, if the conditions in Theorem 11 hold for one input-state-output realization $\mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} := \mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$, then they hold for *all* input-state-output realizations of $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$. Note also that $\tilde{P}$ and $\tilde{Q}$ are not uniquely defined in that theorem, but it is straightforward to show that condition 2 is invariant of the specific choice.

Remark 13 Let X, L_X , and W_X be as in condition 3 of Theorem 11, let $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$, and let $t_0 \leq t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\mathbf{x} \in AC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d)$, then integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{u}^T(t) \mathbf{y}(t) + \mathbf{y}^T(t) \mathbf{u}(t) dt - [\mathbf{x}^T(t) X \mathbf{x}(t)]_{t_0}^{t_1} \\ &= \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (L_X \mathbf{x} + W_X \mathbf{u})^T(t) (L_X \mathbf{x} + W_X \mathbf{u})(t) dt \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

With the notation $S(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T X \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it is straightforward to verify that S is a storage function with respect to the supply rate $\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{y}$ in the sense of (Willems, 1972a, Definition 2). It follows from Theorem 11 that if $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} := \mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$ is passive (in accordance with the trajectory-based Definition 4), then $\mathcal{B}_s$ has a (non-negative) quadratic state storage function.

Remark 14 It is instructive to compare Theorems 7 and 11 with the papers Çamlıbel et al. (2003); Pal and Belur (2008), which consider cyclo-dissipativity in the behavioral framework. The reader who is unfamiliar with these papers may prefer to skip straight to Section 5.

In Çamlıbel et al. (2003); Pal and Belur (2008), cyclo-dissipativity is defined using the formalism of quadratic differential forms (see Appendix C). With $\mathcal{B}$ as in (3.1), then $\mathcal{B}_{C^\infty} := \mathcal{B} \cap C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times C^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is called

cyclo-dissipative with respect to the supply rate $\mathbf{i}^T \mathbf{v}$ (or *cyclo-passive*) if there exists a quadratic differential form Q_ψ such that $\mathbf{i}^T \mathbf{v} \geq \frac{d}{dt} Q_\psi(\text{col}(\mathbf{i} \ \mathbf{v}))$ for all $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{B}_{C^\infty}$ (Pal and Belur, 2008, Definition 3.1). Also, $\mathcal{B}_{C^\infty}$ is called *strictly cyclo-dissipative* with respect to the supply rate $\mathbf{i}^T \mathbf{v}$ (or *strictly cyclo-passive*) if there exists a quadratic differential form Q_ψ and an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mathbf{i}^T \mathbf{v} \geq \frac{d}{dt} Q_\psi(\text{col}(\mathbf{i} \ \mathbf{v})) + \epsilon(\mathbf{i}^T \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{v})$ for all $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{B}_{C^\infty}$ (Pal and Belur, 2008, Definition 3.2). In these definitions, Q_ψ is called a *storage function* (Trentelman and Willems, 1997, Definition 4.2), which is called *non-negative* if $Q_\psi(\text{col}(\mathbf{i} \ \mathbf{v}))(t) \geq 0$ for all $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{B}_{C^\infty}$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The paper Çamlıbel et al. (2003) considered cyclo-passive single-input single-output systems, while Pal and Belur (2008) considered a class of strictly cyclo-dissipative systems which includes the strictly cyclo-passive systems (note that these papers use the word dissipative for what we call cyclo-dissipative systems; we use the word dissipative for systems which have a non-negative storage function, as in Willems (1972a)).

It can be shown that there are cyclo-passive systems which are not passive, and there are passive systems which are not strictly cyclo-passive. Thus the problems considered in Çamlıbel et al. (2003); Pal and Belur (2008) are not equivalent to the problem considered in this paper. It can also be shown from Theorems 7 and 11 and Remark 13 that $\mathcal{B}_{C^\infty}$ is passive in accordance with Definition 4 if and only if $\mathcal{B}_{C^\infty}$ is cyclo-passive with a non-negative storage function. However, there are two notable reasons why we have not defined a passive system as a cyclo-passive system with a non-negative storage function. First, as discussed in Willems (2007), it is preferable to define passivity without invoking an a-priori assumption of the existence of a quadratic storage function. This is one of the main benefits of Definition 4. Second, we note that there is no consensus on the appropriate definition of a cyclo-dissipative system. This concerns the issue of whether to allow for *unobservable storage functions*, as arise in electric networks (see Willems (2004)). As shown in that paper, there are systems which are not cyclo-dissipative (with respect to a given supply rate), but do possess an unobservable storage function with respect to that supply rate (Willems, 2004, Section VI). This issue does not arise with the definition of passivity given in this paper.

We also note that the papers Çamlıbel et al. (2003); Pal and Belur (2008) contain assumptions which are not present in this paper. In Çamlıbel et al. (2003), only single-input single-output systems are considered (i.e., $n = 1$ for $\mathcal{B}$ in (3.1)), for which condition 3 in Definition 6 takes the much simpler form: if $PQ^* + QP^* = 0$, then $[P \ -Q](\lambda)$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Also, Çamlıbel et al. (2003) assume that the system has no uncontrollable imaginary axis modes (i.e., the rank of $[P \ -Q](j\omega)$ is constant for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$). In contrast, we

prove that this condition is necessary whenever $\mathcal{B}$ is passive (note, however, that $Q(j\omega)$ and $P(j\omega)$ need not be nonsingular for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$).

In Pal and Belur (2008), only strictly cyclo-dissipative systems are considered. If $\mathcal{B}$ in (3.1) is strictly cyclo-passive, then it can be shown that 1. $Q(\lambda)$ and $P(\lambda)$ are nonsingular for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$; and 2. $P(j\omega)Q(-j\omega)^T + Q(j\omega)P(-j\omega)^T$ is nonsingular for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. The first condition implies that condition 2 of Definition 6 holds (but the converse implication does not hold). Similarly, the second condition implies that condition 3 of Definition 6 holds (but the converse implication does not hold). Also, the proof of the main results in Pal and Belur (2008) used algebraic Riccati equations and Hamiltonian matrices. This approach cannot be used in this paper as it is possible that $D + D^T$ is singular in Theorem 11.

5 Passive behaviors and positive-real pairs

In Section 2, we showed that the system in Example 3 has a positive-real transfer function, yet is not passive. For this example, it can be shown that $\mathcal{B}_s^{(u,y)} =: \tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \{(u, y) \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \mid (\frac{d^2}{dt^2} + 1)(\frac{d}{dt} + 1)u = (\frac{d^2}{dt^2} + 1)\frac{d}{dt}y\}$. In particular, if $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ is passive, then $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_c = \{(u, y) \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \mid (\frac{d}{dt} + 1)u = \frac{dy}{dt}\}$ must be passive, and it follows that the transfer function $G(\xi) = 1 + 1/\xi$ must be PR. But this condition is not sufficient for $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ to be passive since there are trajectories in $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ with $(\frac{d^2}{dt^2} + 1)((\frac{d}{dt} + 1)u - \frac{dy}{dt}) = 0$ but $(\frac{d}{dt} + 1)u \neq \frac{dy}{dt}$.

As the preceding example indicates, the transfer function does not always determine the behavior of the system. In contrast, the behavior *is* always determined by the polynomial matrices corresponding to the differential equations governing the system (i.e., by P and Q in (3.1)). Thus, passivity will impose requirements on these polynomial matrices. The purpose of this section is to determine these requirements, resulting in Lemma 19. We will first prove some alternative requirements in Lemma 16, which we then show to be equivalent to the conditions in Lemma 19. These alternative requirements relate to the following decomposition of the behavior $\mathcal{B}$ in (3.1) into *controllable* and *autonomous* parts:

Lemma 15 *Let $\mathcal{B}$ in (3.1) and $\text{normalrank}([P \ -Q]) = n$. There exist $F, \tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}, M, N, U, V, X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]$ such that*

$$P = F\tilde{P}, \quad Q = F\tilde{Q}, \quad \text{and} \quad (5.1)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{P} & -\tilde{Q} \\ U & V \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X & M \\ Y & N \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ 0 & I_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} X & M \\ Y & N \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{P} & -\tilde{Q} \\ U & V \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.2)$$

Now, let $F, \tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}, M, N, U, V, X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]$ satisfy (5.1)–(5.2), and let (i) $\mathcal{B}_a := \{(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times$

$\mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \mid P(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i} = Q(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v} \text{ and } U(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i} = -V(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}\}$; (ii) $\mathcal{B}_c := \{(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \mid \tilde{P}(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i} = \tilde{Q}(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}\}$; and (iii) $\hat{\mathcal{B}} := \{(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{i}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{i}_2, \mathbf{v}_2) \mid (\mathbf{i}_1, \mathbf{v}_1) \in \mathcal{B}_a, (\mathbf{i}_2, \mathbf{v}_2) \in \mathcal{B}_c, \mathbf{i} = \mathbf{i}_1 + \mathbf{i}_2 \text{ and } \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_2\}$. Then

$$\mathcal{B}_c \cap \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) = \{(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \mid \exists \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \text{ such that } \mathbf{i} = M(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{w} \text{ and } \mathbf{v} = N(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{w}\}, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\mathcal{B}_a = \{(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \mid \exists \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \text{ with } F(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z} = 0, \text{ such that } \mathbf{i} = X(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z} \text{ and } \mathbf{v} = Y(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z}\}, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\text{and } \mathcal{B} = \hat{\mathcal{B}}^{(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v})}. \quad (5.5)$$

PROOF. To see the first part of the lemma statement, we note that the decomposition is not unique, but one such decomposition is obtained by computing a lower echelon form for $[P \ -Q]$ (see note A4). This gives a unimodular $W \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}[\xi]$ such that $[F \ 0] = [P \ -Q]W$. Then $\hat{W} =: W^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}[\xi]$, and by partitioning $\hat{W}$ (resp., W) we obtain the polynomial matrices in the first (resp., second) block matrix in (5.2).

To show the second part of the lemma, we note initially that (5.3)–(5.4) are easily shown from (5.1)–(5.2) and (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Theorem 3.2.15). Now, consider the compatibly partitioned matrices

$$Z := \begin{bmatrix} F\tilde{P} & -F\tilde{Q} & 0 & 0 \\ U & V & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{P} & -\tilde{Q} \\ I & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad R := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad W := \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & F & -F\tilde{P} & F\tilde{Q} \\ 0 & I & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I \end{bmatrix},$$

and note that $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is the set of locally integrable solutions to $R(\frac{d}{dt})\text{col}(\mathbf{i} \ \mathbf{v}) = Z(\frac{d}{dt})\text{col}(\mathbf{i}_1 \ \mathbf{v}_1 \ \mathbf{i}_2 \ \mathbf{v}_2)$. Next, let $Z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}[\xi]$ be formed from the last four block rows of Z . It is straightforward to verify from (5.2) that Z_2 is unimodular. Also, W is unimodular, and by pre-multiplying R and Z by W we conclude that $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is the set of locally integrable solutions to $P(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i} = Q(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}$ and $\text{col}(0 \ 0 \ \mathbf{i} \ \mathbf{v}) = Z_2(\frac{d}{dt})\text{col}(\mathbf{i}_1 \ \mathbf{i}_2 \ \mathbf{v}_1 \ \mathbf{v}_2)$ (see note B1). In particular, $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{B}$, and it remains to show that, for any given $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{B}$, there exist locally integrable $(\mathbf{i}_1, \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{i}_2, \mathbf{v}_2)$ such that $\text{col}(0 \ 0 \ \mathbf{i} \ \mathbf{v}) = Z_2(\frac{d}{dt})\text{col}(\mathbf{i}_1 \ \mathbf{i}_2 \ \mathbf{v}_1 \ \mathbf{v}_2)$. Accordingly, for any given $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}[\xi]$ with $\text{normalrank}(H) = m$, we let $\Delta(H)$ denote the maximum degree of all determinants composed of m columns of H . Then, from (Polderman, 1997, Theorem 2.8), it suffices to show that there exists a determinant of degree $\Delta([R \ Z])$ formed from the columns in Z together with some of the columns in R .

It can be shown that $\Delta([R \ Z]) = \Delta([\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}]) + \deg(\det(F))$ (this follows since any determinant formed from the columns of $[R \ Z]$ must contain: (i) the $2n$ non-zero columns from the first two block rows of $[R \ Z]$, which form a nonsingular matrix whose determinant is $\det(F)$; and (ii) at least n non-zero columns from the

third block row). Next, let $\Delta([\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}])$ be the degree of the determinant formed from columns $i_1, \dots, i_n$ of $[\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}]$. It can be shown that the degree of the determinant formed from columns $i_1, \dots, i_n$ and $2n+1, \dots, 6n$ of $[R \ Z]$ equals that of the determinant formed from columns $i_1, \dots, i_n$ and $2n+1, \dots, 6n$ of $W[R \ Z]$, which equals $\Delta(F[\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}]) = \Delta([\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}]) + \deg(\det(F)) = \Delta([R \ Z])$. $\square$

Equations (5.3)–(5.4) provide a representation for the infinitely-often differentiable part of the behavior $\mathcal{B}$ in terms of the five matrices M, N, X, Y and $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]$. In the next lemma, we provide three necessary conditions for $\mathcal{B}$ to be passive in terms of these matrices. These correspond to the conditions:

1. $\mathcal{B}_c$ is passive.
2. $\mathcal{B}_a$ is stable. (i.e., $(\mathbf{i}_a, \mathbf{v}_a) \in \mathcal{B}_a \Rightarrow \mathbf{i}_a(t) \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbf{v}_a(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$).
3. If $t_0 \leq t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $(\mathbf{i}_a, \mathbf{v}_a) \in \mathcal{B}_a$, and $(\mathbf{i}_l, \mathbf{v}_l) \in \mathcal{B}_c \cap \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\mathbf{i}_l(t) = \mathbf{v}_l(t) = 0$ for all $t < t_0$ and $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{i}_l^T(t) \mathbf{v}_l(t) dt = 0$, then $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\mathbf{i}_a^T(t) \mathbf{v}_l(t) + \mathbf{v}_a^T(t) \mathbf{i}_l(t)) dt = 0$.

The first of these conditions is to be expected since $\mathcal{B}_c \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. The second condition is equivalent to stabilizability. In fact, it was established in Hughes and Smith (2015) that any passive behavior is stabilizable. However, as discussed in Section 2, the definition of passivity in Hughes and Smith (2015) differs from the definition in this paper. The third of these conditions is new. It represents a coupling condition between the *lossless trajectory* $(\mathbf{i}_l, \mathbf{v}_l)$ and the *autonomous trajectory* $(\mathbf{i}_a, \mathbf{v}_a)$. In fact, this condition must also hold when $\mathcal{B}_a$ is replaced by $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{E}_{C_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{E}_{C_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ (this observation is used in the proof of Theorem 11), and provides the intuition behind the third condition of the following lemma:

Lemma 16 *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be as in (3.1) and let $\mathcal{B}$ be passive. Then $\text{normalrank}([P \ -Q]) = n$. Furthermore, with M, N and F as in Lemma 15, then*

1. $M(\bar{\lambda})^T N(\lambda) + N(\bar{\lambda})^T M(\lambda) \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$.
2. $F(\lambda)$ is nonsingular for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$.
3. If $(\mathbf{i}_s, \mathbf{v}_s) \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{E}_{C_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{E}_{C_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ satisfies $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*N + N^*M) = 0$, then $\mathbf{b}^*(\frac{d}{dt})(M^*(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}_s + N^*(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i}_s) = 0$.

PROOF. We first show that $n = \text{rank}([P \ -Q](\lambda)) = \text{rank}(F(\lambda)[\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}](\lambda))$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$. This implies that $\text{normalrank}([P \ -Q]) = n$ and condition 2 holds. We then show condition 1, and finally condition 3.

Proof that $\text{rank}([P \ -Q](\lambda)) = n$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$: Suppose instead that there exists $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$ such

that $\text{rank}([P \ -Q](\lambda)) < n$. Then $\text{rank}(P(\lambda) + Q(\lambda)) < n$, and so there exists $0 \neq \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $(P(\lambda) + Q(\lambda))\mathbf{z} = 0$. Then, with the notation $\mathbf{v}(t) = \mathbf{z}e^{\lambda t} + \bar{\mathbf{z}}e^{\bar{\lambda}t}$ and $\mathbf{i}(t) = -\mathbf{v}(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we find that $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{B}$. Also, for any given $t_1 \geq t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, then $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{i}^T(t) \mathbf{v}(t) dt = 2\Re(\mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{z} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} e^{2\lambda t} dt) + 2(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^T \mathbf{z}) \int_{t_0}^{t_1} e^{2\Re(\lambda)t} dt$. By considering separately the cases $\Im(\lambda) = 0$ and $\Im(\lambda) \neq 0$, it can be shown that for any given $K \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists $t_1 \geq t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{i}^T(t) \mathbf{v}(t) dt \geq K$, whence $\mathcal{B}$ is not passive. Thus, if $\mathcal{B}$ is passive, then $\text{rank}([P \ -Q](\lambda)) = n$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$.

Proof of condition 1: Consider a fixed but arbitrary $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$ and $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{C}^n$; let $\mathbf{z}(t) = \mathbf{c}e^{\lambda t} + \bar{\mathbf{c}}e^{\bar{\lambda}t}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$; let $\mathbf{i} := M(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{v} := N(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z}$; let $\Phi(\eta, \xi) := M(\eta)^T N(\xi) + N(\eta)^T M(\xi)$; and let $\alpha := \mathbf{c}^T \Phi(\lambda, \lambda) \mathbf{c}$ and $\beta := \bar{\mathbf{c}}^T \Phi(\bar{\lambda}, \lambda) \mathbf{c}$. Then $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{B}$ by Lemma 15, and

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{i}^T(t) \mathbf{v}(t) dt = \Re\left(\alpha \int_{t_0}^{t_1} e^{2\lambda t} dt\right) + \beta \int_{t_0}^{t_1} e^{2\Re(\lambda)t} dt. \quad (5.6)$$

We will show that if there exists a $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$ and $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\beta = \bar{\mathbf{c}}^T \Phi(\bar{\lambda}, \lambda) \mathbf{c} < 0$, then for any given $K \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a $t_1 \geq t_0$ with $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{i}^T(t) \mathbf{v}(t) dt \geq K$. This will prove condition 1.

Let $\lambda = \sigma + j\omega$ for some $\sigma, \omega \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\sigma \geq 0$, and consider a fixed but arbitrary $K \in \mathbb{R}$. We consider the cases (i) $\omega = 0$; and (ii) $\omega \neq 0$. In case (i), let $\Im(\mathbf{c}) = 0$ (so $\lambda = \bar{\lambda}$, $\mathbf{c} = \bar{\mathbf{c}}$, and $\alpha = \beta$). Then, from (5.6), $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{i}^T(t) \mathbf{v}(t) dt = 2\beta \int_{t_0}^{t_1} e^{2\lambda t} dt$, and $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} e^{2\lambda t} dt = (1/2\lambda)(e^{2\lambda t_1} - e^{2\lambda t_0})$ if $\Re(\lambda) \neq 0$, and $t_1 - t_0$ otherwise. In case (ii), for any given integer n , we let $T(n) \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $2\omega T(n) = 2\pi(n + 1/4) - \arg(\alpha/(\sigma + j\omega))$ (note, if $T(n) \geq t_0$, then $n \geq \omega t_0/\pi + 1/4$ when $\omega > 0$, and $n \leq \omega t_0/\pi - 3/4$ when $\omega < 0$). Then $\arg(\alpha e^{2\lambda T(n)})/\lambda = \pi/2$, so from (5.6) we find that $\int_{t_0}^{T(n)} \mathbf{i}^T(t) \mathbf{v}(t) dt = (\beta(e^{2\Re(\lambda)T(n)} - e^{2\Re(\lambda)t_0})/2\Re(\lambda)) - \Re(\alpha e^{2\lambda t_0}/2\lambda)$ if $\Re(\lambda) \neq 0$, and $\beta(T(n) - t_0) - \Re(\alpha e^{2\lambda t_0}/2\lambda)$ otherwise. In both cases (i) and (ii), if $\beta < 0$, then by taking t_1 sufficiently large (and letting $t_1 = T(n)$ in case (ii)), we obtain $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{i}^T(t) \mathbf{v}(t) dt \geq K$.

Proof of condition 3: Let $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ satisfy $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*N + N^*M) = 0$, let $t_0 \leq t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, and consider a fixed but arbitrary $(\mathbf{i}_s, \mathbf{v}_s) \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{E}_{C_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{E}_{C_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $z \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$. Then, with the notation $\mathbf{i} := M(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{b}(\frac{d}{dt})z + \mathbf{i}_s$ and $\mathbf{v} := N(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{b}(\frac{d}{dt})z + \mathbf{v}_s$, it

follows that $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{B}$ by Lemma 15. Also, with

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &:= \int_{t_0}^{t_1} ((M(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{b}(\frac{d}{dt})z)^T (N(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{b}(\frac{d}{dt})z))(t)dt, \text{ and} \\ J_2 &:= \int_{t_0}^{t_1} ((M(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{b}(\frac{d}{dt})z)^T \mathbf{v}_s + (N(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{b}(\frac{d}{dt})z)^T \mathbf{i}_s)(t)dt, \\ \text{then } \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\mathbf{i}^T \mathbf{v})(t)dt &= J_1 + J_2 + \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\mathbf{i}_s^T \mathbf{v}_s)(t)dt. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Since $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*N + N^*M) = 0$ then, from note C3,

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \frac{1}{2} [L_{\Phi_{M\mathbf{b}}}(z, (N\mathbf{b})(\frac{d}{dt})z)(t) + L_{\Phi_{N\mathbf{b}}}(z, (M\mathbf{b})(\frac{d}{dt})z)(t)]_{t_0}^{t_1}, \\ \text{and } J_2 &= \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (z(\mathbf{b}^*(\frac{d}{dt})(M^*(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}_s + N^*(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i}_s)))(t)dt \\ &\quad + [L_{\Phi_{M\mathbf{b}}}(z, \mathbf{v}_s)(t) + L_{\Phi_{N\mathbf{b}}}(z, \mathbf{i}_s)(t)]_{t_0}^{t_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $g := \mathbf{b}^*(\frac{d}{dt})(M^*(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}_s + N^*(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i}_s)$; let $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ and $t_0 \leq t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $\psi(t) = 0$ for all $t \leq t_0$, and $\frac{d^k \psi}{dt^k}(t_1) = 0$ ($k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$); let $z := g\psi$; and let $f := g^2$. Then, $z, f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$; $f(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$; $J_1 = 0$; and $J_2 = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (f\psi)(t)dt$. Moreover, since $(\mathbf{i}_s, \mathbf{v}_s) \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, then it is straightforward to show that $\mathbf{i}_s^T \mathbf{v}_s \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, and that there exists an $M \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\int_{t_0}^t (\mathbf{i}_s^T \mathbf{v}_s)(t)dt < M$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Thus, from (5.7), there exists an $M \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (\mathbf{i}^T \mathbf{v})(t)dt > -\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (f\psi)(t)dt - M$. Finally, we will show that, for any given $K \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist ψ and t_1 with the properties outlined above which satisfy $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} (f\psi)(t)dt > K + M$. This proves condition 3.

Let $\phi(t) = e^{1/(t^2-1)}$ for $-1 < t < 1$ with $\phi(t) = 0$ otherwise. Also, for any given integer k , let $g_k(t) := f(t)\phi(t-1-t_0-2k)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $g_k \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ and $\int_{t_0+2k}^{t_0+2(k+1)} g_k(t)dt > 0$ ($k = 0, 1, \dots$). Now, let N be a positive integer with $N > K + M$, and let $\psi(t) = -\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \phi(t-1-t_0-2k) / (\int_{t_0+2k}^{t_0+2(k+1)} g_k(t)dt)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. It can be verified that $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$; $\psi(t) = 0$ for all $t \leq t_0$; $\frac{d^l \psi}{dt^l}(t_0 + 2k) = 0$ for $k, l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$; and $-\int_{t_0}^{t_0+2N} (f\psi)(t)dt = N > K + M$. $\square$

In the next lemma, we present several equivalent conditions to the third condition in Lemma 16. This will lead to two algebraic tests for this condition (see Remark 18), and will allow us to establish Lemma 19.

Lemma 17 *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be as in (3.1); let $\text{rank}([P \ -Q](\lambda)) = n$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$; and let $F, \tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}, M, N, U, V, X, Y$, and $\mathcal{B}_a$ be as in Lemma 15. The following are equivalent:*

1. If $(\mathbf{i}_s, \mathbf{v}_s) \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ satisfies $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*N + N^*M) = 0$, then $\mathbf{b}^*(\frac{d}{dt})(M^*(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}_s + N^*(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i}_s) = 0$.
2. If $(\mathbf{i}_a, \mathbf{v}_a) \in \mathcal{B}_a$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ satisfies $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*N + N^*M) = 0$, then $\mathbf{b}^*(\frac{d}{dt})(M^*(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}_a + N^*(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{i}_a) = 0$.
3. If $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ satisfies $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*N + N^*M) = 0$, then there exists $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ such that $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*Y + N^*X) = \mathbf{p}^T F$.
4. If $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ satisfies $\mathbf{c}^T(\tilde{P}\tilde{Q}^* + \tilde{Q}\tilde{P}^*) = 0$, then there exists $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ such that $\mathbf{c}^T = \mathbf{p}^T F$.
5. If $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy $\mathbf{p}^T(PQ^* + QP^*) = 0$ and $\mathbf{p}(\lambda)^T[P \ -Q](\lambda) = 0$, then $\mathbf{p}(\lambda) = 0$.

PROOF. 1 $\iff$ 2. That 1 $\Rightarrow$ 2 follows since $\text{rank}([P \ -Q](\lambda)) = n$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ implies $F(\lambda)$ is non-singular for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$, and so $\mathcal{B}_a \subseteq \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ by Lemma 15 and (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Section 3.2.2). Then 2 $\Rightarrow$ 1 since, by Lemma 15, if $(\mathbf{i}_s, \mathbf{v}_s) \in \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, then there exists $(\mathbf{i}_a, \mathbf{v}_a) \in \mathcal{B}_a$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\mathbf{i}_s = M(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{i}_a$ and $\mathbf{v}_s = N(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{v}_a$.

2 $\iff$ 3. To see that 2 $\Rightarrow$ 3, note initially from Lemma 15 that condition 2 implies that if $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ satisfies $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*N + N^*M) = 0$, and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies $F(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z} = 0$, then $\mathbf{b}^*(\frac{d}{dt})(M^*Y + N^*X)(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z} = 0$. From note B2, this implies that there exists $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ such that $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*Y + N^*X) = \mathbf{p}^T F$. Similarly, from Lemma 15, it is straightforward to show that 3 $\Rightarrow$ 2.

3 $\iff$ 4. Note initially from (5.2) that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{P} & -\tilde{Q} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -\tilde{Q}^* & V^* \\ \tilde{P}^* & U^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y^* & X^* \\ N^* & M^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X & M \\ Y & N \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_n & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.8)$$

To prove that 3 $\Rightarrow$ 4, note that if $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ satisfies $\mathbf{c}^T(\tilde{P}\tilde{Q}^* + \tilde{Q}\tilde{P}^*) = 0$, then from (5.8) it follows that $\mathbf{b}^* := \mathbf{c}^T(\tilde{P}V^* - \tilde{Q}U^*)$ satisfies $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*N + N^*M) = 0$. Thus, from condition 3, there exists $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ such that $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*Y + N^*X) = \mathbf{p}^T F$. But $\mathbf{b}^*(M^*Y + N^*X) = \mathbf{c}^T(\tilde{P}V^* - \tilde{Q}U^*)(M^*Y + N^*X)$, and from (5.8) we find that $\mathbf{c}^T = \mathbf{c}^T(\tilde{P}V^* - \tilde{Q}U^*)(M^*Y + N^*X) = \mathbf{p}^T F$. The proof of 4 $\Rightarrow$ 3 is similar.

4 $\iff$ 5. To see that 4 $\Rightarrow$ 5, we let $r := \text{normalrank}(\tilde{P}\tilde{Q}^* + \tilde{Q}\tilde{P}^*)$, and we let the rows of $V_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r) \times n}[\xi]$ be a basis for the left syzygy of $\tilde{P}\tilde{Q}^* + \tilde{Q}\tilde{P}^*$ (see note A3). Then condition 4 implies that there exists $\hat{V}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r) \times n}[\xi]$ such that $V_1 = \hat{V}_1 F$. Since $V_1(\lambda)$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, then so too must $\hat{V}_1(\lambda)$. Since, in addition, $PQ^* + QP^* = F(\tilde{P}\tilde{Q}^* + \tilde{Q}\tilde{P}^*)F^*$, then $\hat{V}_1(PQ^* + QP^*) = V_1(\tilde{P}\tilde{Q}^* + \tilde{Q}\tilde{P}^*)F^* = 0$ and $\text{normalrank}(PQ^* + QP^*) = \text{normalrank}(\tilde{P}\tilde{Q}^* + \tilde{Q}\tilde{P}^*)$,

and we conclude that the rows of $\hat{V}_1$ are a basis for the left syzygy of $PQ^* + QP^*$. It follows that if $\mathbf{p}^T(PQ^* + QP^*) = 0$ then there exists $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r)}[\xi]$ such that $\mathbf{p}^T = \mathbf{g}^T \hat{V}_1$. If, in addition, $\mathbf{p}(\lambda)^T[P \ -Q](\lambda) = 0$, then $\mathbf{p}(\lambda)^T F(\lambda) = 0$, whence $\mathbf{g}(\lambda)^T \hat{V}_1(\lambda) F(\lambda) = \mathbf{g}(\lambda)^T V_1(\lambda) = 0$. But $V_1(\lambda)$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, and we conclude that $\mathbf{g}(\lambda) = 0$ and so $\mathbf{p}(\lambda) = 0$. To show that $5 \Rightarrow 4$, we let the rows of $\hat{V}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r) \times n}[\xi]$ be a basis for the left syzygy of $PQ^* + QP^*$. Then, from condition 5, we conclude that $\mathbf{c}(\lambda)^T \hat{V}_1(\lambda) F(\lambda) = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{c}(\lambda)^T = 0$, and it follows that $\hat{V}_1(\lambda) F(\lambda)$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. In a similar manner to before, it can then be shown that the rows of $\hat{V}_1 F$ are a basis for the left syzygy of $\tilde{P}\tilde{Q}^* + \tilde{Q}\tilde{P}^*$. Hence, if $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n[\xi]$ satisfies $\mathbf{c}^T(\tilde{P}\tilde{Q}^* + \tilde{Q}\tilde{P}^*) = 0$, then there exists $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r)}[\xi]$ such that $\mathbf{c}^T = \mathbf{g}^T \hat{V}_1 F$, and be letting $\mathbf{p}^T := \mathbf{g}^T \hat{V}_1$ we obtain condition 4. $\square$

Remark 18 Let $\mathcal{B}, F, \tilde{P}, \tilde{Q}, M, N, U, V, X, Y$, and $\mathcal{B}_a$ be as in Lemma 17 (with $\text{rank}([P \ -Q](\lambda)) = n$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$). Lemma 17 leads to two tests which can be implemented by a standard symbolic algebra program (and using exact arithmetic if the coefficients in the polynomial matrices are all rational numbers). As in the proof of Lemma 17, we let $r := \text{normalrank}(PQ^* + QP^*)$, and we note that it is straightforward to show from the proof of that lemma that $\text{normalrank}(M^*N + N^*M) = r$.

1. Using the matrices M, N, X, Y and F :
 - (a) Compute a $V \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r) \times n}$ whose rows are a basis for the left syzygy of $M^*N + N^*M$.
 - (b) Condition 3 of Lemma 17 holds if and only if $V(M^*N + N^*M)$ is divisible on the right by F .
2. Using the matrices P and Q :
 - (a) Compute a $V \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r) \times n}$ whose rows are a basis for the left syzygy of $PQ^* + QP^*$.
 - (b) Condition 5 of Lemma 17 holds if and only if $V(PQ^* + QP^*)(\lambda)$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 19 Consider the system $\mathcal{B}$ in (3.1). If $\mathcal{B}$ is passive, then (P, Q) is a positive-real pair.

PROOF. That (P, Q) satisfy condition 2 in Definition 6 follows from condition 2 of Lemma 16, by noting from (5.1)–(5.2) that $[P \ -Q]\text{col}(X \ Y) = F$. Then condition 3 in Definition 6 follows from Lemma 17 and condition 3 of Lemma 16. It remains to show that condition 1 of Definition 6 holds. To see this, first note from condition 1 of Lemma 16 that $((M + N)(\bar{\lambda})^T(M + N)(\lambda) - (N - M)(\bar{\lambda})^T(N - M)(\lambda)) \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Next, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfy $(M + N)(\lambda)\mathbf{z} = 0$. We then require $-\mathbf{z}^*((N - M)(\bar{\lambda})^T(N - M)(\lambda))\mathbf{z} \geq 0$, which implies that $(N - M)(\lambda)\mathbf{z} = 0$, and we conclude that $M(\lambda)\mathbf{z} = 0$ and $N(\lambda)\mathbf{z} = 0$. Then from (5.2) we obtain $\mathbf{z} = U(\lambda)M(\lambda)\mathbf{z} + V(\lambda)N(\lambda)\mathbf{z} = 0$. We conclude

that $(M + N)(\lambda)$ is nonsingular for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Accordingly, with the notation $H := (N - M)(M + N)^{-1}$, then $I \geq H(\bar{\lambda})^T H(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. This implies that $I \geq H(\lambda)H(\bar{\lambda})^T$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ (to see this, let $X = H(\lambda)$, and note that $I - XX^* = (I - XX^*)(I - XX^*) + X(I - X^*X)X^*$). Then, noting that $PM = QN$ implies that $(P + Q)H = (P - Q)(M + N)(M + N)^{-1} = P - Q$, we find that $(P + Q)(\lambda)(P + Q)(\bar{\lambda})^T \geq (P + Q)(\lambda)H(\lambda)H(\bar{\lambda})^T(P + Q)(\bar{\lambda})^T = (P - Q)(\lambda)(P - Q)(\bar{\lambda})^T$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. We conclude that condition 1 of Definition 6 holds. $\square$

6 Passive behavior theorem

In this final section, we prove Theorems 7 and 11.

PROOF OF THEOREM 11 (see p. 5). We first prove that $1 \Rightarrow 2 \Rightarrow 4 \Rightarrow 3 \Rightarrow 1$.

$1 \Rightarrow 2$. By Lemma 9, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ takes the form of (3.2). Hence, $(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q})$ is a positive-real pair by Lemma 19.

$2 \Rightarrow 4$. To prove this implication, we will show conditions (i) and (ii) below. The notation in those conditions is as follows. We let $T = \text{col}(T_1 \ T_2)$ be such that $\tilde{C} = [\tilde{C}_1 \ 0] = CT^{-1}$ and $\tilde{A} = TAT^{-1}$ have the observer staircase form indicated in note D2, and we let $TB =: \tilde{B}$, and $T_1B =: \tilde{B}_1$. Then, with $\tilde{A}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_1}$ as in note D2, we let $\tilde{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_1}$ be such that $\tilde{T}\tilde{A}_{11}\tilde{T}^{-1} = \text{diag}(A_s \ A_u)$ where $\text{spec}(A_s) \in \mathbb{C}_-$ and $\text{spec}(A_u) \in \mathbb{C}_+$ (existence of such a $\tilde{T}$ follows from (Gantmacher, 1980, Chapter VII), or alternatively from the real Jordan form for $\tilde{A}_{11}$; here, letting $\hat{d}$ denote the number of columns (and rows) of A_s , then the first $\hat{d}$ rows (resp., last $d_1 - \hat{d}$ rows) of $\tilde{T}$ span the stable (resp., unstable) left eigenspace of $\tilde{A}_{11}$). We partition $\tilde{T}\tilde{B}_1$ and $\tilde{C}_1\tilde{T}^{-1}$ compatibly with $\tilde{T}\tilde{A}_{11}\tilde{T}^{-1} = \text{diag}(A_s \ A_u)$ as $\tilde{T}\tilde{B}_1 = \text{col}(B_s \ B_u)$ and $\tilde{C}_1\tilde{T}^{-1} = [C_s \ C_u]$. We then let $G_s(\xi) = D + C_s(\xi I - A_s)^{-1}B_s$ and $G_u(\xi) = C_u(\xi I - A_u)^{-1}B_u$, and direct calculation shows that $G(\xi) = D + \tilde{C}_1(\xi I - \tilde{A}_{11})^{-1}\tilde{B}_1 = G_s(\xi) + G_u(\xi)$. We will show that:

- (i) There exists a real $X_u > 0$ such that $-A_u^T X_u - X_u B_u = 0$ and $C_u^T - X_u B_u = 0$.
- (ii) There exist real matrices X_s, L, W such that $X_s > 0$, $-A_s^T X_s - X_s A_s = L^T L$, $C_s^T - X_s B_s = L^T W$, and $D + D^T = W^T W$, where $Z_{X_s} := W + L(\xi I - A_s)^{-1}B_s$ is a spectral factor of $G + G^*$.

We note that $\hat{T} := \text{col}(\tilde{T}T_1 \ T_2) = \text{diag}(\tilde{T} \ I)T$ is nonsingular. Then, with $\hat{A} := \hat{T}\hat{A}\hat{T}^{-1}$, $\hat{B} := \hat{T}\hat{B}$, $\hat{C} := \hat{C}\hat{T}^{-1}$, $\hat{X} := \text{diag}(X_s \ X_u \ 0)$, $L_{\hat{X}} := [L \ 0 \ 0]$, and $W_{\hat{X}} := W$, it can be verified that $\hat{X} \geq 0$; $-\hat{A}^T \hat{X} - \hat{X} \hat{A} = \text{diag}((-A_s^T X_s - X_s A_s) \ (-A_u^T X_u - X_u A_u) \ 0) = L_{\hat{X}}^T L_{\hat{X}}$, $\hat{C}^T - \hat{X} \hat{B} = \text{col}((C_s^T - X_s B_s) \ (C_u^T - X_u B_u) \ 0) =$

$L_X^T W_{\hat{X}}$ and $D + D^T = W_{\hat{X}}^T W_{\hat{X}}$; and $Z_{\hat{X}} = W_{\hat{X}} + L_{\hat{X}}(\xi I - \hat{A})^{-1} \hat{B}$ is a spectral factor of $G + G^*$. Finally, with $X := \hat{T}^T \hat{X} \hat{T}$, $L_X := L_{\hat{X}} \hat{T}$, and $W_X := W_{\hat{X}}$, it can be verified that X, L_X , and W_X satisfy condition 4.

We first prove (i). Direct calculation verifies that $G = \tilde{Q}^{-1} \tilde{P}$. Since $(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q})$ is a positive-real pair and $\tilde{Q}$ is nonsingular, then G is PR. To see this, note that if G is analytic in $\mathbb{C}_+$ then $G(\lambda) + G(\bar{\lambda})^T = \tilde{Q}^{-1}(\lambda)(\tilde{P}(\lambda)\tilde{Q}(\bar{\lambda})^T + \tilde{Q}(\lambda)\tilde{P}(\bar{\lambda})^T)(\tilde{Q}^{-1}(\bar{\lambda}))^T \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. But suppose instead that G has a pole at some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. By considering the Laurent series for G about λ , it can be shown that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and an $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\eta| \leq \epsilon$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^T(G(\lambda + \eta) + G(\bar{\lambda} + \bar{\eta})^T)\mathbf{z} < 0$: a contradiction.

Since G is analytic in $\mathbb{C}_+$ and $G = G_u + G_s$ where $G_s(\xi) = D + C_s(\xi I - A_s)^{-1} B_s$ (whose poles are all in $\mathbb{C}_-$) and $G_u(\xi) = C_u(\xi I - A_u)^{-1} B_u$ (whose poles are all in $\mathbb{C}_+$), then the poles of G_u must all be on $j\mathbb{R}$. Since, in addition, G is PR, then G_u and G_s are both PR and $G_u + G_u^* = 0$ (Anderson and Vongpanitlerd, 1973, Section 5.1). Next, note that $\tilde{B}$ is stabilizable (by condition 2 of Definition 6), and has the observable realization in note D3, whence $[\lambda I - \tilde{A}_{11} \quad \tilde{B}_1]$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ (this follows from note D4). It is then easily shown that $[\lambda I - A_u \quad B_u]$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, so (A_u, B_u) is controllable. Similarly, it can be shown that (C_u, A_u) is observable since $(\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{A}_{11})$ is. Thus, $G_u(\xi) = C_u(\xi I - A_u)^{-1} B_u$ is PR with $G_u + G_u^* = 0$ and with (A_u, B_u) controllable and (C_u, A_u) observable, and so (i) holds by (Willems, 1972b, Theorem 5).

Next, let $A_s(\xi) := \xi I - A_s$; let M and N be as in Lemma 15 (so, in particular, M is invertible, and $NM^{-1} = Q^{-1}P = G$ which is PR); let $r = \text{normalrank}(M^*N + N^*M)$; and let $K \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}[\xi]$ be a spectral factor for $M^*N + N^*M$ (i.e., $K(\lambda)$ has full column rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$, and $K^*K = M^*N + N^*M$). To prove condition (ii), we will show the following four conditions:

- (a) There exist $J \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \hat{d}}[\xi]$ and $L \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \hat{d}}$ such that $K^*L + JA_s = M^*C_s$.
- (b) With L as in (a), there exists $X_s \in \mathbb{R}^{\hat{d} \times \hat{d}}$ such that $-A_s^T X_s - X_s A_s = L^T L$.
- (c) $Z := KM^{-1}$ is a spectral factor of $G + G^*$ and, with $W := \lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} Z(\xi)$, then $Z = W + LA_s^{-1}B_s$. In particular, $D + D^T = W^T W$.
- (d) With Z, W and L as in (a)–(c), then $C_s^T - X_s B_s = L^T W$.

To show (a), recall that $K^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}[\xi]$ has normalrank equal to r , and let $\text{col}(H_1 \ H_2) = H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]$ be a unimodular matrix such that the rows of $H_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r) \times n}[\xi]$ are a basis for the left syzygy of K^* , so $H_2 K^* = 0$ and $H_1 K^* \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}[\xi]$ has normalrank equal to r (e.g.,

consider the upper echelon form for K^* , see note A4). We will show that: (a)(i) there exists $L \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \hat{d}}$ and $J_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \hat{d}}[\xi]$ such that $H_1 K^* L + J_1 A_s = H_1 M^* C_s$; and (a)(ii) there exists $J_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r) \times \hat{d}}[\xi]$ such that $J_2 A_s = H_2 M^* C_s$. Since $H_2 K^* = 0$ and H is unimodular, then with $J := H^{-1} \text{col}(J_1 \ J_2)$ we find that J and L satisfy the conditions in (a).

To see (a)(i), note from the definitions of H, K and A_s that $(H_1 K^*)(\lambda)$ is nonsingular for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_-$ and $A_s(\lambda)$ is nonsingular for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Furthermore, from (Gantmacher, 1980, pp. 77–79), there exist $E \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \hat{d}}[\xi]$ and $F \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \hat{d}}$ such that $H_1 M^* C_s = EA_s + F$. Then, from (Feinstein and Bar-Ness, 1980, Theorem II), there exist $L \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \hat{d}}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \hat{d}}[\xi]$ such that $H_1 K^* L + RA_s = F$. With $J_1 := E + R$, we obtain condition (a)(i).

To see (a)(ii), we let $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_s := \{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}_s) \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times AC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{\hat{d}}) \mid \frac{d\mathbf{x}_s}{dt} = A_s \mathbf{x}_s \text{ and } \mathbf{y} = C_s \mathbf{x}_s\}$. Note that, if $(\mathbf{v}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) \in \hat{\mathcal{B}}_s$, then $\mathbf{v}_s \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $(0, \mathbf{v}_s, \hat{T}^{-1} \text{col}(\mathbf{x}_s \ 0 \ 0)) \in \mathcal{B}_s$, and so $(0, \mathbf{v}_s) \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. We then let $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \hat{d}}[\xi]$ be left coprime matrices satisfying $UC_s = VA_s$, so, from Willems (1986); Rapisarda and Willems (1997); Hughes (2016a), it follows that $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_s^{(\mathbf{y})} = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \mid U(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{y} = 0\}$ (c.f., Lemma 9). Thus, if $\mathbf{v}_s \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies $U(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}_s = 0$, then $(0, \mathbf{v}_s) \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}} \cap \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{C}_-}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Next, note from Lemmas 17 and 19 that condition 1 of Lemma 17 holds. Also, since $H_2 K^* = 0$, then $H_2 K^* K = H_2(M^*N + N^*M) = 0$. We conclude that, if $\mathbf{v}_s \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfies $U(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}_s = 0$, then $H_2(\frac{d}{dt})M^*(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{v}_s = 0$. It follows from note B2 that there exists $S \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r) \times n}[\xi]$ such that $H_2 M^* = SU$, whence $H_2 M^* C_s = SUC_s = SV A_s$. With $J_2 := SV$, we obtain condition (a)(ii).

Condition (b) follows since $\text{spec}(A_s) \in \mathbb{C}_-$ implies that $X_s = \int_0^\infty e^{A_s^T t} L^T L e^{A_s t} dt$ satisfies $X_s \geq 0$ and $-A_s^T X_s - X_s A_s = L^T L$.

To show (c), we first let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfy $M(\lambda)\mathbf{z} = 0$. We recall that $NM^{-1} = G$ is PR, and hence G is analytic in $\mathbb{C}_+$, and it follows that $N(\lambda)\mathbf{z} = G(\lambda)M(\lambda)\mathbf{z} = 0$. Then, from (5.2), it follows that $(U(\lambda)M(\lambda) + V(\lambda)N(\lambda))\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z} = 0$. We conclude that $M(\lambda)$ is nonsingular for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Since, in addition, K is a spectral factor of $MN^* + NM^*$, then it is straightforward to show that Z is a spectral factor of $G + G^* = M^{-1}N + N^*(M^{-1})^*$.

We next let $W := \lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} Z(\xi)$, and we will show that: (c)(i) $W + LA_s^{-1}B_s - Z$ has no poles in $\mathbb{C}_-$; and (c)(ii) $W + LA_s^{-1}B_s - Z$ has no poles in $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$.

Since, in addition $W = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} (Z(\xi))$, then we conclude that $W + LA_s^{-1}B_s = Z$. It then follows that, $W^T W = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} (Z^*(\xi)Z(\xi)) = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} (G(\xi) + G^*(\xi)) = D + D^T$.

To show (c)(i), we note that $K^*(W + LA_s^{-1}B_s - Z) = K^*W + K^*LA_s^{-1}B_s - M^*Z^*Z = K^*W + K^*LA_s^{-1}B_s - M^*(D + D^T + C_s A_s^{-1}B_s + B_s^T (A_s^*)^{-1} C_s^T)$. Clearly, $(A_s^*)^{-1}$ has no poles in $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$, and from (a) it follows that $K^*LA_s^{-1} - M^*C_s A_s^{-1} = -J$, which has no poles in $\mathbb{C}_-$. Thus, $K^*(W + LA_s^{-1}B_s - Z)$ has no poles in $\mathbb{C}_-$. Since $K^*(\lambda)$ has full column rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_-$, then we conclude that $W + LA_s^{-1}B_s - Z$ has no poles in $\mathbb{C}_-$.

To see (c)(ii), we note that, since $G + G^* = D + D^T + C_s A_s^{-1}B_s + B_s^T (A_s^*)^{-1} C_s^T$, and A_s^{-1} (resp., $(A_s^*)^{-1}$) has no poles in $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$ (resp., $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$), then $(G + G^*)(j\omega)$ is analytic for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, whence Z is analytic in $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$. It follows that $W + LA_s^{-1}B_s - Z$ has no poles in $\bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$.

Finally, to show condition (d), note initially from (b) that $X_s A_s^{-1} + (A_s^*)^{-1} X_s = (A_s^*)^{-1} L^T L A_s^{-1}$. Next, note that $M^*(W^T L + B_s^T X_s - C_s) A_s^{-1} = M^*(W^T + B_s^T (A_s^*)^{-1} L^T) L A_s^{-1} - M^* C_s A_s^{-1} - M^* B_s^T (A_s^*)^{-1} X_s$. Also, $M^*(W^T + B_s^T (A_s^*)^{-1} L^T) = M^* Z^* = K^*$ by (c). Thus, from (a), we find that $M^*(W^T L + B_s^T X_s - C_s) A_s^{-1} = (K^* L - M^* C_s) A_s^{-1} - M^* B_s^T (A_s^*)^{-1} X_s = -J - M^* B_s^T (A_s^*)^{-1} X_s$. It follows that $M^*(W^T L + B_s^T X_s - C_s) A_s^{-1}$ has no poles in $\mathbb{C}_-$. But $M^*(\lambda)$ is nonsingular for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_-$, and we conclude that $(W^T L + B_s^T X_s - C_s) A_s^{-1}$ has no poles in $\mathbb{C}_-$. It is then straightforward to show that this implies that $W^T L + B_s^T X_s - C_s = 0$.

4 $\Rightarrow$ 3. Immediate.

3 $\Rightarrow$ 1. Consider a fixed but arbitrary $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ satisfy $\hat{\mathbf{u}}(t) = \mathbf{u}(t)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}(t) = \mathbf{y}(t)$ for all $t < t_0$. Then, from note D3, there exists $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}(t_0)$. From remark 13, since $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^T(t_1) X \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_1) \geq 0$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}(t_0)$, then $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}^T(t) \hat{\mathbf{y}}(t) dt \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T(t_0) X \mathbf{x}(t_0)$. This inequality holds for all $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ which satisfy $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \hat{\mathbf{y}}(t)) = (\mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{y}(t))$ for all $t < t_0$, whence $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ is passive.

We next assume that $D + D^T > 0$, and we prove 4 $\Rightarrow$ 5 $\Rightarrow$ 3. First, let X, L_X, W_X and Z_X be as in condition 4. Since $n \geq \text{normalrank}(G + G^*) \geq \text{rank}(D + D^T) = n$, then $\text{normalrank}(G + G^*) = n$, so $Z_X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}(\xi)$, and $W_X = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} (Z(\xi)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. As $W_X^T W_X = D + D^T$, which is nonsingular, then W_X is nonsingular. We then find that $-A^T X - XA - (C^T - XB)(D + D^T)^{-1}(C - B^T X) = L_X^T L_X - L_X^T W_X W_X^{-1} (W_X^T)^{-1} W_X^T L_X = 0$. Next, suppose $X \geq 0$ is real and satisfies $\Pi(X) = 0$; let W_X be a real nonsingular matrix with $D + D^T = W_X^T W_X$; and let $L_X := (W_X^T)^{-1}(C - B^T X)$. Then X, L_X and W_X satisfy condition 3.

We next prove condition (i). Accordingly, we suppose that condition 3 holds, and we let X, L_X and W_X be as in that condition. To show condition (i)(a), suppose that (C, A) is observable and there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $X\mathbf{z} = 0$. Since X is symmetric, then $\mathbf{z}^T X = 0$. Thus, $\mathbf{z}^T (-A^T X - XA)\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}^T L_X^T L_X \mathbf{z} = 0$, whence $L_X \mathbf{z} = 0$. It follows that $(C - B^T X)\mathbf{z} = W_X^T L_X \mathbf{z} = 0$, and so $C\mathbf{z} = 0$. Furthermore, $(-A^T X - XA)\mathbf{z} = L_X^T L_X \mathbf{z} = 0$, so $XA\mathbf{z} = 0$. By replacing $\mathbf{z}$ with $A\mathbf{z}$ in the preceding argument, we find that $L_X A\mathbf{z} = 0$, $CA\mathbf{z} = 0$, and $XA^2\mathbf{z} = 0$. Proceeding inductively, we obtain $CA^k\mathbf{z} = 0$ ($k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$). Since (C, A) is observable, then $\mathbf{z} = 0$, and we conclude that $X > 0$. To show condition (i)(b), we let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ satisfy $(\lambda I - A)\mathbf{z} = 0$. Then $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^T L_X^T L_X \mathbf{z} = \bar{\mathbf{z}}^T (-A^T X - XA)\mathbf{z} = -(\bar{\lambda} + \lambda) \bar{\mathbf{z}}^T X \mathbf{z} \leq 0$, whence $L_X \mathbf{z} = 0$ and $X\mathbf{z} = 0$. Since $X > 0$ by condition (i)(a), then $\mathbf{z} = 0$, and we conclude that $\text{spec}(A) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$.

It remains to prove condition (ii). Condition (ii)(a) was shown in the proof of 4 $\Rightarrow$ 5. To show condition (ii)(b), we note that $A + B(D + D^T)^{-1}(B^T X - C) = A - BW_X^{-1} L_X$, and we consider a fixed but arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$. From the proof of condition (i)(b), if there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ such that $(\lambda I - A)\mathbf{z} = 0$, then $L_X \mathbf{z} = 0$, whence $(\lambda I - (A - BW_X^{-1} L_X))\mathbf{z} = (\lambda I - A)\mathbf{z} = 0$. It remains to show that if $\lambda I - A$ is nonsingular, then $\lambda I - (A - BW_X^{-1} L_X)$ is nonsingular. Accordingly, suppose that $\lambda I - A$ is nonsingular and there exists a $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ such that $\mathbf{y}^T (\lambda I - (A - BW_X^{-1} L_X)) = 0$. Then $\mathbf{y}^T (\lambda I - (A - BW_X^{-1} L_X)) (\lambda I - A)^{-1} B = \mathbf{y}^T B + \mathbf{y}^T BW_X^{-1} L_X (\lambda I - A)^{-1} B = \mathbf{y}^T B + \mathbf{y}^T BW_X^{-1} (Z_X(\lambda) - W_X) = \mathbf{y}^T BW_X^{-1} Z_X(\lambda) = 0$. But $W_X^{-1} Z_X(\lambda)$ has full row rank, so $\mathbf{y}^T B = 0$. Thus, $\mathbf{y}^T (\lambda I - A) = \mathbf{y}^T (\lambda I - (A - BW_X^{-1} L_X)) - \mathbf{y}^T BW_X^{-1} L_X = 0$, which implies that $\mathbf{y} = 0$. $\square$

Remark 20 We note that the matrix L in the above theorem can be obtained by considering the Jordan chains of A_s . Specifically, let A_s have eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ with Jordan chains $(\mathbf{v}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N(\lambda_i)})$, $\dots$, $(\mathbf{v}_{n,1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{N(\lambda_n)})$. Also, for any given $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}(\xi)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that λ is not a pole of H , let $H_{\lambda,j}$ denote the j th term in the Taylor expansion for H about λ , i.e., $H_{\lambda,j} = \frac{1}{j!} (\frac{d^j}{d\xi^j} H)(\lambda)$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots$. Then L can be obtained by solving the equations

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (K_{\lambda_i,j}^* L \mathbf{v}_{i,k-j} - M_{\lambda_i,j}^* C \mathbf{v}_{i,k-j}) = 0, \quad (6.1)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $k = 1, \dots, N(\lambda_i)$. It can then be shown that, if $\text{spec}(A) \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_-$ and condition 3 of Theorem 11 holds, then (Pandolfi, 2001, equation (4)) must hold.

To show (6.1), we consider the Jordan chain for A_s corresponding to an eigenvalue λ : $(\lambda I - A_s)\mathbf{v}_1 = 0$, $(\lambda I - A_s)\mathbf{v}_j + \mathbf{v}_{j-1} = 0$ ($j = 2, \dots, N(\lambda)$). With the notation

$\mathcal{A}_s(\xi) := \xi I - A_s$, then if $J \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \tilde{d}}[\xi]$ and $L \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times \tilde{d}}$ satisfy $K^* L + J A_s = M^* C_s$, we require $K_{\lambda,j}^* L - M_{\lambda,j}^* C_s = -\frac{1}{j!} \frac{d^j}{d\xi^j} (J A_s)(\lambda) = -J_{\lambda,j} A_s(\lambda) - J_{\lambda,j-1}$. Thus, for $k = 1, \dots, N(\lambda)$, $\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (K_{\lambda,j}^* L \mathbf{v}_{k-j} - M_{\lambda,j}^* C \mathbf{v}_{k-j}) = -\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (J_{\lambda,j} A_s(\lambda) \mathbf{v}_{k-j}) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (J_{\lambda,i-1} \mathbf{v}_{k-i}) = -\sum_{j=0}^{k-2} (J_{\lambda,j} (A_s(\lambda) \mathbf{v}_{k-j} + \mathbf{v}_{k-j-1})) - J_{\lambda,k-1} A_s(\lambda) \mathbf{v}_1 = 0$.

PROOF OF THEOREM 7 (see p. 5). That $1 \Rightarrow 2$ was shown in Lemma 19. Here, we will show $2 \Rightarrow 3 \Rightarrow 1$.

$2 \Rightarrow 3$. We let $\hat{P} := P - Q$ and $\hat{Q} := P + Q$. Since (P, Q) is a positive-real pair, then $\hat{Q}(\lambda) \hat{Q}(\bar{\lambda})^T - \hat{P}(\lambda) \hat{P}(\bar{\lambda})^T \geq 0$ and $\text{rank}([\hat{P} \ -\hat{Q}](\lambda)) = n$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$. We will show that: (i) $\hat{Q}(\lambda)$ is nonsingular for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$; and (ii) $\hat{Q}^{-1} \hat{P}$ is proper. To see (i), suppose there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$ such that $\mathbf{z}^T \hat{Q}(\lambda) = 0$. Then $-\mathbf{z}^T \hat{P}(\lambda) \hat{P}(\bar{\lambda})^T \bar{\mathbf{z}} \geq 0$, which implies that $\mathbf{z}^T \hat{P}(\lambda) = 0$. Since $\text{rank}([\hat{P} \ -\hat{Q}](\lambda)) = n$, then this implies that $\mathbf{z} = 0$. To see (ii), note that since $\hat{Q}(\lambda)$ is nonsingular for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$, then $I - (\hat{Q}^{-1} \hat{P})(\lambda) (\hat{Q}^{-1} \hat{P})(\bar{\lambda})^T \geq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$, and it is then easily shown that $\hat{Q}^{-1} \hat{P}$ is proper.

Let $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}[\xi]$ with $\text{normalrank}(R) = m$, and recall the notation $\Delta(R)$ from the proof of Lemma 15. If R is partitioned as $R = [R_1 \ R_2]$ where $R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}[\xi]$ is nonsingular, then $R_2^{-1} R_1$ is proper if and only if $\deg(\det(R_2)) = \Delta(R)$ (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Theorem 3.3.22). Thus, $\deg(\det(\hat{Q})) = \Delta([\hat{P} \ -\hat{Q}])$. But $\det(\hat{Q}) = \det(P + Q)$, which is the sum of all the determinants composed of columns of P together with the complementary columns of Q (i.e., $\det([\mathbf{p}_1 \ \mathbf{p}_2 \ \dots]) + \det([\mathbf{q}_1 \ \mathbf{p}_2 \ \dots]) + \det([\mathbf{p}_1 \ \mathbf{q}_2 \ \dots]) + \dots$, where $\mathbf{p}_k$ (resp., $\mathbf{q}_k$) denotes the k th column of P (resp., Q)). From among the determinants in this sum, we pick one of greatest degree, we let $T = \text{col}(T_1 \ T_2)$ be a permutation matrix such that T_1^T (resp., T_2^T) selects the columns from Q (resp., P) appearing in this determinant, and we define $\tilde{Q} := [QT_1^T \ -PT_2^T]$ and $\tilde{P} := [PT_1^T \ -QT_2^T]$. Then $\deg(\det(\tilde{Q})) \geq \deg(\det(P + Q)) = \Delta([\hat{P} \ -\hat{Q}])$. Furthermore, $T_1^T T_1 + T_2^T T_2 = I$ as T is a permutation matrix, and with the notation

$$S_1 := \begin{bmatrix} T_1^T & 0 & 0 & T_2^T \\ 0 & T_2^T & T_1^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } S_2 := \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} I & I \\ -I & I \end{bmatrix},$$

we find that $S_1 S_1^T = 2S_2 S_2^T = I$, and $[\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}] = [P \ -Q] S_1 = [\hat{P} \ -\hat{Q}] S_2 S_1$. Then, from the Binet-Cauchy formula, we obtain $\Delta([\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}]) = \Delta([\hat{P} \ -\hat{Q}])$ (Hughes, 2016a, proof of Theorem 7.2). Since, in addition, $\Delta([\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}]) \geq \deg(\det(\tilde{Q})) \geq \Delta([\hat{P} \ -\hat{Q}])$, then $\deg(\det(\tilde{Q})) = \Delta([\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}])$, so $\tilde{Q}^{-1} \tilde{P}$ is proper.

Since $S_1 S_1^T = I$, then $[\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}] (\frac{d}{dt}) S_1^T \text{col}(\mathbf{i} \ \mathbf{v}) = [P \ -Q] (\frac{d}{dt}) \text{col}(\mathbf{i} \ \mathbf{v})$. Thus, with $\mathbf{i}_1 = T_1 \mathbf{i}$, $\mathbf{i}_2 = T_2 \mathbf{i}$, $\mathbf{v}_1 = T_1 \mathbf{v}$, and $\mathbf{v}_2 = T_2 \mathbf{v}$, it follows that $\mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ have the compatible partitions $\mathbf{i} := (\mathbf{i}_1, \mathbf{i}_2)$ and $\mathbf{v} := (\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} := \mathcal{B}^{(\text{col}(\mathbf{i}_1 \ \mathbf{v}_2), \text{col}(\mathbf{v}_1 \ \mathbf{i}_2))}$ takes the form of (3.2). Thus, from Lemma 10, there exists a state-space model $\mathcal{B}_s$ as in (2.1) such that $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$. Moreover, it is straightforward to verify that $(\tilde{P}, \tilde{Q})$ is a positive-real pair since (P, Q) is, and we conclude from Theorem 11 that $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ is passive.

$3 \Rightarrow 1$. Note from the preceding discussion that $\mathcal{B}$ takes the form of (3.1) where $[P \ -Q] = [\tilde{P} \ -\tilde{Q}] S_1^T$. Now, let $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$; let $(\hat{\mathbf{i}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ be a fixed but arbitrary trajectory satisfying $(\hat{\mathbf{i}}(t), \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t)) = (\mathbf{i}(t), \mathbf{v}(t))$ for all $t < t_0$; and let $\mathbf{u} := \text{col}(T_1 \mathbf{i} \ T_2 \mathbf{v})$, $\mathbf{y} := \text{col}(T_1 \mathbf{v} \ T_2 \mathbf{i})$, $\hat{\mathbf{u}} := \text{col}(T_1 \hat{\mathbf{i}} \ T_2 \hat{\mathbf{v}})$, and $\hat{\mathbf{y}} := \text{col}(T_1 \hat{\mathbf{v}} \ T_2 \hat{\mathbf{i}})$. Then $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$, $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$, and $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \hat{\mathbf{y}}(t)) = (\mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{y}(t))$ for all $t < t_0$. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ is passive, there exists a $K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}^T(t) \hat{\mathbf{y}}(t) dt < K$ for all $t_1 \geq t_0$. Since, in addition $T_1^T T_1 + T_2^T T_2 = I$, then $-\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \hat{\mathbf{i}}^T(t) \hat{\mathbf{v}}(t) dt = -\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}^T(t) \hat{\mathbf{y}}(t) dt < K$, and we conclude that $\mathcal{B}$ is passive. $\square$

7 Conclusions

The positive-real lemma links the concepts of passivity, positive-real transfer functions, spectral factorisation, linear matrix inequalities, and algebraic Riccati equations. However, the lemma only considers systems described by a controllable state-space model, which leaves important questions unanswered. For example, it does not specify which uncontrollable systems are passive. In this paper, we sought to answer this question and others by proving two new theorems: the passive behavior theorem, parts 1 and 2.

References

- Anderson, B. D. O., Vongpanitlerd, S., 1973. Network Analysis and Synthesis. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Çamlıbel, M. K., Willems, J. C., Belur, M. N., Dec. 2003. On the dissipativity of uncontrollable systems. In: Proceedings of the 42nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, Hawaii.
- Collado, J., Lozano, R., Johansson, R., July 2001. On Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov lemma for stabilizable systems. IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control 46 (7), 1089–1093.
- Feinstein, J., Bar-Ness, Y., 1980. On the uniqueness of the minimal solution to the matrix polynomial equation $A(\lambda)X(\lambda) - Y(\lambda)B(\lambda) = C(\lambda)$. Journal of the Franklin Institute 310 (2), 131–134.

Ferrante, A., May 2005. Positive real lemma: Necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of solutions under virtually no assumptions. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control* 50 (5), 720–724.

Ferrante, A., Pandolfi, L., October 2002. On the solvability of the positive real lemma equations. *Systems and Control Letters* 47 (3), 211–219.

Gantmacher, F. R., 1980. *The Theory of Matrices*. Vol. I. New York : Chelsea.

Hughes, T. H., 2016a. Behavioral realizations using companion matrices and the Smith form. *SIAM Journal on Control Optim.* 54(2), 845–865.

Hughes, T. H., 2016b. Controllability of passive single-input single-output systems. In: 2016 European Control Conference (ECC). pp. 1087–1092.

Hughes, T. H., Smith, M. C., 2015. Controllability of linear passive network behaviors. In press, *Systems and Control Letters*, doi:10.1016/j.sysconle.2015.09.011.

Kunimatsu, S., Sang-Hoon, K., Fujii, T., Ishitobi, M., 2008. On positive real lemma for non-minimal realization systems. *Proceedings of the 17th IFAC World Congress*, Seoul, 5868–5873.

Pal, D., Belur, M. N., 2008. Dissipativity of uncontrollable systems, storage functions, and Lyapunov functions. *SIAM Journal on Control Optim.* 47 (6), 2930–2966.

Pandolfi, L., Mar 2001. An observation on the positive real lemma. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 255 (2), 480–490.

Polderman, J. W., 1997. Proper elimination of latent variables. *Systems and Control Letters* 32 (5), 261–269.

Polderman, J. W., Willems, J. C., 1998. *Introduction to Mathematical Systems Theory: A Behavioral Approach*. New York : Springer-Verlag.

Rapisarda, P., Willems, J. C., 1997. State maps for linear systems. *SIAM Journal on Control Optim.* 35 (3), 1053–1091.

Trentelman, H. L., Willems, J. C., December 1997. Every storage function is a state function. *Systems and Control Letters* 32 (5), 249–259.

Willems, J. C., December 1971. Least squares stationary optimal control and the algebraic Riccati equation. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control* 16 (6), 621–634.

Willems, J. C., 1972a. Dissipative dynamical systems, Part I: General theory. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 45, 321–351.

Willems, J. C., 1972b. Dissipative dynamical systems, Part II: Linear systems with quadratic supply rates. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 45, 352–393.

Willems, J. C., Sept. 1986. From time series to linear system—Part I. finite dimensional linear time invariant systems. *Automatica* 22 (5), 561–580.

Willems, J. C., 2004. Hidden variables in dissipative systems. *Proceedings of the 43rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 358–363.

Willems, J. C., 2007. Dissipative dynamical systems. *European Journal on Control* 13, 134–151.

Willems, J. C., Trentelman, H. L., September 1998. On

quadratic differential forms. *SIAM Journal on Control Optim.* 36 (5), 1703–1749.

Wolovich, W. A., 1974. *Linear Multivariable Systems*. New York : Springer-Verlag.

Youla, D. C., July 1961. On the factorization of rational matrices. *IRE Trans. Information Theory* 7 (3), 172–189.

Zhou, K., Doyle, J. C., Glover, K., 1996. *Robust and Optimal Control*. New Jersey : Prentice Hall.

A Polynomial and rational matrices

Several of the results in this paper depend on the properties of polynomial matrices which we describe here.

A1 $U \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}[\xi]$ is called *unimodular* if there exists $V \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}[\xi]$ such that $UV = I$ (whence $VU = I$). U is unimodular if and only if $\det(U)$ is a non-zero constant.

A2 Let $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times n_1}[\xi]$ and $R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times n_2}[\xi]$. We say that R_1 and R_2 are *left coprime* if $[R_1 \ R_2](\lambda)$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

A3 Let $R \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times n}[\xi]$. The *left syzygy* of R is the set of $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^l[\xi]$ which satisfy $\mathbf{c}^T R = 0$. If $\text{normalrank}(R) = m$, then there exists $V \in \mathbb{R}^{(l-m) \times l}[\xi]$ such that (i) $V(\lambda)$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$; and (ii) $VR = 0$. If $V \in \mathbb{R}^{(l-m) \times l}[\xi]$ satisfies (i) and (ii), then $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^l[\xi]$ is in the left syzygy of R if and only if there exists a $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{l-m}[\xi]$ such that $\mathbf{p}^T V = \mathbf{c}^T$; and we say that the rows of V are a basis for the left syzygy of R .

A4 Given any $R \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times n}[\xi]$ with $\text{normalrank}(R) = m$, there exists a unimodular $U \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}[\xi]$ (resp., $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}[\xi]$) such that $UR = \text{col}(\tilde{R} \ 0_{(l-m) \times n})$ (resp., $RV = [\hat{R} \ 0_{l \times (n-m)}]$), where $\tilde{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}[\xi]$ is in either (i) upper echelon form, or (ii) row reduced form (resp., $\hat{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times m}[\xi]$ is in either (ib) lower echelon form, or (iib) column reduced form) (Gantmacher, 1980, Chapter VI), Wolovich (1974). The last $l - m$ rows of U are a basis for the left syzygy of R . Evidently, if R is para-Hermitian, then $URU^* = \text{diag}(\Phi \ 0)$ where $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}[\xi]$ is para-Hermitian and nonsingular.

B Linear systems and behaviors

Here, we provide relevant results from behavioral theory (see Polderman and Willems (1998)).

B1 Let $\mathcal{B}_1 = \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^k) \mid R_1(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{w} = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_2 = \{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^k) \mid R_2(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{w} = 0\}$ for some $R_1, R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times k}[\xi]$. Then $\mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B}_2$ if and only if there exists a unimodular $U \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l}[\xi]$ such that $R_1 = UR_2$ (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Theorem 3.6.2). The requirement that R_1 and R_2 have the same number of rows is of little consequence since the addition or deletion of rows of zeros doesn't alter the behavior.

B2 Let $F \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times n}[\xi]$, $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times n}[\xi]$, and $\mathcal{B} := \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \mid F(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z} = 0\}$. If $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{B}$ implies $G(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z} = 0$,

then there exists $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times m_1}[\xi]$ such that $G = HF$. To see this, note that $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \mid \text{col}(F \ G)(\frac{d}{dt})\mathbf{z} = 0\}$. It follows from note B1 that there exists a unimodular matrix U such that $U\text{col}(F \ 0_{m_2 \times n}) = \text{col}(F \ G)$. We form H from the last m_2 rows and first m_1 columns of U to obtain $G = FH$.

B3 Consider a system $\mathcal{B}$ as in (1.1). $\mathcal{B}$ is called *controllable* if, for any two trajectories $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{B}$ and $t_1 \geq t_0$ such that $\mathbf{w}(t) = \mathbf{w}_1(t)$ for all $t \leq t_0$ and $\mathbf{w}(t) = \mathbf{w}_2(t)$ for all $t \geq t_1$ (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Definition 5.2.2); and *stabilizable* if for any $\mathbf{w}_1 \in \mathcal{B}$ there exists $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathbf{w}(t) = \mathbf{w}_1(t)$ for all $t \leq t_0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{w}(t) = 0$ (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Definition 5.2.29). $\mathcal{B}$ is controllable (resp., stabilizable) if and only if the rank of $R(\lambda)$ is the same for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ (resp., $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$) (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Theorems 5.2.10, 5.2.30).

C Bilinear and quadratic differential forms

Bilinear and quadratic differential forms were introduced in Willems and Trentelman (1998), and are useful for studying dissipativity. Some relevant definitions and results are presented here.

C1 A *bilinear differential form* is a mapping from $\mathcal{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m) \times \mathcal{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\mathcal{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ of the form $L_\Phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^N (\frac{d^{i-1}}{dt^{i-1}} \mathbf{w})^T \Phi_{ij} (\frac{d^{j-1}}{dt^{j-1}} \mathbf{x})$, for some positive integers M, N and real-valued matrices Φ_{ij} . It is naturally associated with the two variable polynomial matrix $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}[\xi, \eta]$ defined as $\Phi(\xi, \eta) := \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^N \Phi_{ij} \xi^{i-1} \eta^{j-1}$. If $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}[\xi, \eta]$, then $Q_\Phi(\mathbf{w}) := L_\Phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w})$ is called a *quadratic differential form*.

C2 Let $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}[\xi, \eta]$ and let $\Psi(\xi, \eta) := (\xi + \eta)\Phi(\xi, \eta)$. Then the product rule of differentiation gives $\frac{d}{dt} L_\Phi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) = L_\Psi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x})$.

C3 To any given $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}[\xi]$ we associate the bilinear differential form L_{Φ_R} , where $\Phi_R(\xi, \eta) := (R(\xi) - R(-\eta))/(\xi + \eta)$. Since $\xi = -\eta$ implies $R(\xi) - R(-\eta) = 0$, then $\Phi_R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}[\xi, \eta]$ from the factor theorem. Furthermore, from note C2, $(R(\frac{d}{dt}) \mathbf{w})^T \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w}^T (R^T(-\frac{d}{dt}) \mathbf{x}) = \frac{d}{dt} L_{\Phi_R}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x})$, so, for any given $t_1 \geq t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (R(\frac{d}{dt}) \mathbf{w})^T(t) \mathbf{x}(t) dt \\ &= \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{w}^T(t) (R^T(-\frac{d}{dt}) \mathbf{x})(t) dt + [L_{\Phi_R}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x})(t)]_{t_0}^{t_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $R(\frac{d}{dt}) = \frac{d}{dt}$, then $\Phi_R = 1$, and this becomes the formula for integration by parts.

D States and state-space models

In this final appendix, we provide several useful definitions and results concerning state-space models.

D1 Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (2.1). Then, for any given $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a unique $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$, which is given by the variation of the constants formula (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Section 4.5.2): $\mathbf{x}(t) = e^{A(t-t_0)} \mathbf{x}_0 + \int_{t_0}^t e^{A(t-\tau)} B \mathbf{u}(\tau) d\tau$ for all $t \geq t_0$; $\mathbf{x}(t) = e^{A(t-t_0)} \mathbf{x}_0 - \int_t^{t_0} e^{A(t-\tau)} B \mathbf{u}(\tau) d\tau$ for all $t < t_0$; and $\mathbf{y} = C\mathbf{x} + D\mathbf{u}$. Note that we require $\mathbf{x}$ to be absolutely continuous (if we allowed any locally integrable weak solution to $\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = A\mathbf{x} + B\mathbf{u}$, then the value of $\mathbf{x}$ at any given instant $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ would not be uniquely determined by this formula).

D2 Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (2.1); let $V_o := \text{col}(C \ CA \ \dots \ CA^{d-1})$ and $\text{rank}(V_o) = d_1$; let the columns of S_2 be a basis for the set $\{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid V_o \mathbf{z} = 0\}$; let $S = [S_1 \ S_2]$ be non-singular; and partition $T := S^{-1}$ compatibly with S as $T = \text{col}(T_1 \ T_2)$. Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{bmatrix} A \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & S_2 \end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A}_{11} & 0 \\ \tilde{A}_{21} & \tilde{A}_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad C \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & S_2 \end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{C}_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $(\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{A}_{11})$ is observable: the *observer staircase form* (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Corollary 5.3.14).

D3 Let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (2.1); let V_o , S and T be as in note D2; let $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$; and let $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. If $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$, $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}) \in \mathcal{B}$, and $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \hat{\mathbf{y}}(t)) = (\mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{y}(t))$ for all $t < t_0$, then there exists $(\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}(t_0)$. This follows from the following two observations, which are easily shown from the variation of the constants formula: (i) if $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-d_1}$, then there exists $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$ with $T_2 \mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{z}$; and (ii) if $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}), (\hat{\mathbf{u}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{B}_s$, and $(\mathbf{u}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)) = (\hat{\mathbf{u}}(t), \hat{\mathbf{y}}(t))$ for all $t < t_0$, then $T_1 \mathbf{x}(t_0) = T_1 \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t_0)$.

Also, with $\tilde{A}_{11}$ and $\tilde{C}_1$ as in note D2, and $\tilde{B}_1 := T_1 B$, then it follows from the variation of the constants formula that $\mathcal{B} = \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$, with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_s = \{ & (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times AC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{d_1}) \\ & \text{such that } \frac{d\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}{dt} = \tilde{A}_{11} \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \tilde{B}_1 \mathbf{u} \text{ and } \mathbf{y} = \tilde{C}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + D\mathbf{u} \}. \end{aligned}$$

D4 Let $\hat{\mathcal{B}} = \{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{L}_1^{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n) \times AC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d) \mid \frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = A\mathbf{x} + B\mathbf{u}\}$. The following are equivalent: (i) $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is controllable; (ii) $[\lambda I - A \ B]$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$; and (iii) (A, B) is controllable (Polderman and Willems, 1998, Section 5.2.1). Now, let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be as in (2.1); let $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_s^{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y})}$; and let (C, A) be observable. Then $\mathcal{B}$ is controllable (resp., stabilizable) if and only if $[\lambda I - A \ B]$ has full row rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ (resp., $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{C}}_+$). This can be shown in the manner of (Hughes, 2016a, proof of Theorem 5.2).